

# THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE



# Bulletin

Vol. XXXVI, No. 927

April 1, 1957

**THE UNITED STATES LOOKS AT THE MIDDLE  
EAST • by Deputy Under Secretary Murphy . . . . . 515**

**THIRD MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE SOUTH-  
EAST ASIA TREATY ORGANIZATION**  
*Final Communique . . . . . 527*  
*Statements by Secretary Dulles . . . . . 529*  
*Secretary Dulles' News Conference, Canberra, March 13 . . . 533*

**UNITED STATES REPLIES TO SOVIET PROPOSAL  
FOR DECLARATION ON MIDDLE EAST . . . . . 523**

**COMPLIANCE WITH U.N. RESOLUTION CALLING  
FOR WITHDRAWAL OF ISRAEL FROM  
EGYPTIAN TERRITORY**  
*Statement by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, March 8 . . . 543*  
*Statement by U.N. Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld,  
February 22 . . . . . 544*  
*Report of U.N. Secretary-General, March 8 . . . . . 544*

*For index see inside back cover*

THE  
OFFICIAL  
WEEKLY RECORD  
OF  
UNITED STATES  
FOREIGN POLICY

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

# Bulletin

VOL. XXXVI, No. 927 • PUBLICATION 6471

April 1, 1957

*The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.*

*Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.*

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents  
U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:  
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25  
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 19, 1955).

**Note:** Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

## The United States Looks at the Middle East

*by Deputy Under Secretary Murphy*<sup>1</sup>

I am indeed grateful for this opportunity to appear here at Georgetown University and before this forum for a discussion of some of the problems of the Middle East. The issues which have arisen during the last 6 months within that area have engaged the loyalties and sympathies of the American people. There has been a high degree of involvement of local American interest in the solutions of the problems posed by the Middle East. We of the State Department appreciate a chance to talk over this situation with an informal audience such as this and to express our views as to the best course to follow in the national interest of the United States.

I am also delighted with the formulation of the topic for this evening's presentation. It seems most appropriate to exchange views on the Middle East at this time in hope that we may achieve a better understanding of the delicate problems involved. Georgetown's inquiries into our foreign relations are justly famous, and I hope I may be of even some small assistance to you in your study of the area.

The United States has vital security interests in the Middle East. These interests are magnified by our role as leader of the free world.

In the first place, it would be a major setback in this great struggle if the two-hundred-odd million Moslems of the area should be persuaded that they could achieve their destiny as nations under the sway of international communism. The Soviet Union has become very active in this region. Its expansionist purposes are unmistakable.

Secondly, the Middle Eastern area specifically contains perhaps 75 percent or more of the world's oil resources under its sands. The continuing uninterrupted flow of this oil is necessary to the economic and military strength of our European allies, which in turn is necessary to our own security. Although we can, as is presently being demonstrated, temporarily supply our European allies with their fuel needs, the drain upon the reserves of the Western Hemisphere over a protracted period would greatly weaken the free world.

Finally, the Middle East area itself is of great strategic geographic importance. It controls both the land and sea routes linking Asia, with its raw-material resources, with Western Europe, which is the major supplier to Asia of manufactured goods essential to its development. It controls the gateway to Africa, with its vast human and mineral resources, which is just beginning to play its role upon the world stage.

Hence, the United States must act with a high degree of responsibility and friendly impartiality in the clashes of national interests which are keeping the Middle East in a state of turmoil. We consider the people in the area our friends, and we want them to remain our friends.

The major internal problem, which overshadows every other issue in the area, is the Arab-Israeli dispute. The creation of the State of Israel has a significant and illuminating background. In fact, I should like this evening to dwell on the origin and causes of some of the situations we face in the area, in the hope that our present objectives and courses of action will be more readily understood.

<sup>1</sup> Address made at the International Relations Enquiry at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., on Mar. 14 (press release 145).

## Emergence of Nationalism in Middle East

A good starting point is the emergence of nationalism in the Middle East some time during the latter half of the 19th century. The Ottoman Empire had by then grown accustomed to its role as a "sick man." But the forces of nationalism were already at work among its peoples. A Viennese journalist, Theodore Herzl, motivated by the clamor and implications of the Dreyfus affair in France, decided that the Jewish people could not achieve a secure status until they had become identified with a national entity. He succeeded in restating the age-old religious longing of the Jews to return to the Holy Land in modern nationalistic terms.

These same forces were at work among the Arab peoples of the Ottoman Empire. The brief emergence of Egypt under Muhammad Ali in the early years of the century as a power which could challenge the world order had given new hope to those who dreamed of the days when an Arab caliph had ruled a united Islam. We Americans had more than a little to do with the emergence of an Arab nationalism which thought and spoke in the popular terms of the day. It was in our educational and missionary institutions in the area that the Arabic language had a rebirth and where our political philosophy received eager acceptance.

In the course of World War I, the Allied Powers sought the support of both of these nationalisms. The appeal to Jewish nationalism took the form of the Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917. The appeal to the Arabs took the form of assurances and encouragement to the Sharif of Mecca, Protector of the Holy Places of Islam, who revolted against his Turkish overlords in the hope of assuming a new caliphate. The romantic figure of Lawrence of Arabia stalks through these pages of history.

At the close of the war, the British found themselves in possession of a mandated area handed them by the League of Nations. This area appeared to be almost as barren in resources as it was rich in religious and historical tradition and controversy. It was soon divided into two separate entities: Palestine and Transjordan.

Transjordan was brought into being as a fief for the late King Abdullah. Abdullah was one of the sons of the Sharif of Mecca. His brother, Feisal, who had been proclaimed as King of Syria, was beleaguered by the French in Damascus, who

were attempting to assert the authority given them by the League for their mandate in Syria and Lebanon. Abdullah's presence in Syria would have been an embarrassment to the British; so it was decided that he should be asked to tarry on his journey and remain in Transjordan, where a state of his own would be established. Winston Churchill has told how he created Transjordan one Sunday afternoon while he was in Jerusalem. All this came to pass, and during King Abdullah's lifetime the State of Transjordan was a model of the close collaboration between the Arabs and Great Britain. The Arab Legion was created and maintained by the British and proved its worth when it assisted Allied forces in putting down a revolt in Iraq in 1941.

In Palestine, that portion of the mandate to the west of the Jordan River, there was rapid economic and social development as Jews from all over the world came to take on the task of draining the marshes and making the desert bloom. It soon became apparent, however, that reconciliation of Jewish and Arab nationalism in this state would not be an easy task. There was bloodshed between Arabs and Jews almost from the very beginning of the mandate. Indeed, the longest period of real tranquillity in Palestine was the duration of World War II, when the magnitude of events on the world scene made pointless the local conflict.

## Partition of Palestine

At the close of World War II, violence again erupted in Palestine. Britain made a final supreme effort to reach an amicable settlement between Arabs and Jews. When this failed, Britain decided to turn the problem over to the United Nations. After dispatching a commission to the field to study the problem and make recommendations, the United Nations General Assembly voted in November 1947 to recommend both the partition of Palestine into an Arab and a Jewish state, to be politically independent but in economic union, and the territorial internationalization of Jerusalem. Jewish leaders decided to accept this recommendation, although it fell considerably short of their expectations, and proclaimed their state in May 1948. Arab leaders both within and outside Palestine decided to contest it by force.

The United States had strongly supported the partition resolution in the General Assembly and

was  
shou  
Figh  
seve  
Arm  
with  
agr  
in a  
twe  
Nat  
as t  
rela  
Stat  
Uni  
had  
tiati  
T  
Arm  
that  
whic  
prov  
terr  
stat  
far  
poss  
Nab  
inco  
whil  
Kin  
depe  
Jew  
inter  
divi  
Isra  
the  
T  
repe  
quiet  
the  
and  
subs  
Jord  
distr  
othe  
full  
long  
The  
ally  
Gene  
Arab  
ing u  
Apri



was deeply concerned that a peaceful solution should be reached in the Palestine problem. Fighting broke out in 1948 and continued through several broken United Nations truces until General Armistice Agreements were signed in accordance with a Security Council directive in 1949. These agreements were to have been but the first step in a process leading to a peace arrangement between the parties brought about under United Nations auspices. They have remained to this day as the only international agreements regulating relations between Israel and the neighboring Arab States. Ralph Bunche [Under-Secretary of the United Nations], who is back in the area today, had a great deal to do with the successful negotiation of these agreements.

The territorial situation emerging from the Armistice Agreements was quite different from that envisaged in the partition resolution. Israel, which had surprised the world with its military prowess, was in occupation of considerably more territory than that originally allotted to the Jewish state. Transjordan, whose Arab Legion was by far the most effective Arab fighting force, gained possession of the Judean hills stretching from Nablus to Hebron. This territory was formally incorporated into Transjordan, which had meanwhile in 1950 changed its name to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. The proposal for an independent Arab state in economic union with the Jewish state fell by the wayside, as did that for an internationalized Jerusalem. Jerusalem has been divided and is under *de facto* occupation by the Israelis in the New City and by the Jordanians in the Old.

These events were bound to have tremendous repercussions in Jordan, which was no longer a quiet and well-ordered Arab entity oriented toward the British. Its population was trebled overnight, and one-third of its inhabitants were Arab refugees subsisting on a United Nations dole. The new Jordan faced its relationship with Britain with distrust arising out of the Palestine conflict. Like other nations in the region, Jordan desired to assert full sovereignty and independence and to cast off longstanding ties with larger powers in the West. The assassination of King Abdullah, a staunch ally of Britain, in 1951, the dismissal of Lieutenant General Glubb and other Arab leaders from the Arab Legion in 1955, the anger at Britain for having undertaken military operations against Egypt,

all hastened the desire to minimize British influence. The Anglo-Jordan Treaty of 1948, under which the British guaranteed Jordan's territorial integrity and subsidized Jordan's defense establishment, was terminated yesterday. Jordan, which recognizes its lack of economic viability and acknowledges its need for foreign aid, has sought such assistance from the Arab states of Egypt, Syria, and Saudi Arabia. Jordanians have also expressed the hope that United States aid can be increased. It is difficult to see a secure and prosperous future for Jordan in the absence of an Arab-Israel settlement.

Since 1948 Israel has seen a trebling of population and considerable economic development. Economic progress has been impaired by the lack of political stability in the area, however, and Israel daily encounters the obstacles to progress created by continuing Arab hostility. Israelis have had to become used to border incidents, economic warfare, and lack of any kind of relations with their immediate neighbors.

It might be worth while to add a footnote to this historical excursus about how and why the Gaza Strip came into being. The territory of the town of Gaza and the land to the north and south of it were allotted, under the 1947 partition resolution, to the Arab state. When Egypt undertook military operations in Palestine in 1948, it entered Palestinian territory at the old international frontier to the south of Gaza. The end of the hostilities and the signing of the armistice saw Egypt remaining in occupation of the 5-by-25-mile strip of territory along the Mediterranean with Gaza roughly at its center. Egypt continued to occupy this territory by virtue of the Armistice Agreement. Egypt never claimed sovereignty over the Strip but said that it was held in military occupation subject to an ultimate peace settlement which would secure the rights of the Palestine Arabs. In addition to the indigenous population of about 60,000, there are 200,000 Arab refugees who fled from what is now Israel. So even before the creation of the United Nations Emergency Force, the United Nations had considerable responsibility for the care and subsistence of at least two-thirds of the population of Gaza.

#### **The New Regime in Egypt**

Egypt is the spearhead of Arab hostility to Israel. Egypt, too, has undergone important

changes in the recent past. New revolutionary leaders forced the abdication of King Farouk in 1952 and proclaimed a republic in 1953. The new regime set itself with enthusiasm to the task of improving basic economic conditions. Large estates were broken up. Attention was given to irrigation projects to reclaim desert lands. The passage of legislation to encourage foreign investment suggested realistic appraisal of the country's need of outside help. There were even faint glimmers of hope for a realistic and rational approach to the intensely emotional problem of Palestine.

To this seemingly devoted leadership the United States offered encouragement and support. We sought to promote understanding and conciliation between Egypt and Britain in the longstanding dispute over the British-held base in Suez. Without taking sides or pressuring either party, we worked to keep open the avenue of conciliation, and just before the second anniversary of the regime in Egypt agreement in principle was announced on this thorny problem. We offered technical assistance to stimulate the pace of development and economic aid, in keeping with the country's capacity to absorb it, to accelerate the rate of economic growth. In the last 5 years we have provided Egypt with nearly \$90 million of assistance in various forms.

Recognizing the country's need to strengthen its internal security and keep its defenses in readiness, the United States indicated willingness to make reasonable quantities of defensive arms available to the new government. The Egyptian leaders studied a grant-aid agreement which we were prepared to enter into and decided against it. They asked to buy arms. They found difficulty in paying for them, and we agreed to consider alternative financing arrangements. We were underbid in terms of financing. Egypt bought Soviet arms in exchange for Egyptian cotton—cotton, a commodity bulging from our own warehouses, a commodity we could not consider importing in quantity.

Although deeply concerned at this evidence of new Soviet mischief in the area, we sought to continue fruitful cooperation with Egypt in other spheres. Egypt's wish to store within its own borders its share of the untapped waters of the Nile received our sympathetic consideration. We were not unmindful of some expert opinion that

storage in the humid upper reaches of the Nile—outside Egypt's boundaries—might involve less loss by evaporation. We were not unmindful of the rights of other riparian states, and our offer of help for the Aswan Dam presupposed agreement on division of waters. But, basically, it looked as though the Egyptian leadership was fully determined to commit its resources to the High Dam. Their determination seemed to be a driving economic force in itself. We offered to help. In reply Egypt asked that our help be given on a basis which caused us misgivings. We reluctantly reached the conclusion that other commitments had undermined the possibility of a sustained economic effort on Egypt's part, without which our assistance would be unavailing.

We continued willing to assist on less ambitious projects. We announced our decision regarding the Aswan Dam on July 19 last year. On July 26 Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal Company.

The stubborn, unpleasant realities—the economic facts of life—have not been conducive to the kind of relationship we had hoped to develop. We felt these economic problems could not be gainsaid. Our views were received with suspicion and misunderstanding by colonial-sensitive Arab opinion as being animated by selfish interest.

Our hopes for cooperation were dimmed by a historical legacy which for the most part involved nations other than the United States. This is ironic but basic to our situation in Egypt, in Syria, and to a lesser degree in other parts of the region. Happily this is not the case in Lebanon, a sophisticated and advanced nation with which we maintain friendly relations, nor is it true in Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and some other countries.

#### **The Arabian Peninsula**

As we move away from the countries at the core of the Arab-Israel dispute, the focus of our interest and concern in the Middle East shifts. The recent visit of King Saud was symbolic of the spotlight being thrown increasingly on one of the least known parts of the Arab world, the Arabian peninsula. This peninsula, approximately one-third the area of the United States, contains a variety of peoples, lands, resources, and historical backgrounds. It is the cradle of the modern Arab people. It has in the past been the home of fabled rulers, like the Queen of Sheba, and the spices and

incenses of Biblical times probably came from its highlands.

Since the consolidation of the Saudi Kingdom in 1925, Saudi Arabia has been the largest and in many ways the most important of the states of the peninsula. The United States has had relations of special importance with this Kingdom since the 1930's and is currently negotiating an agreement which will provide for further cooperation. King Saud is an important Arab leader and as Keeper of the Holy Shrines at Mecca and Medina is a figure of growing significance in the Arab world. Firmly committed against communism, he follows his father's traditional policy of close friendship with the United States.

The other major independent kingdom in the peninsula is the highland state of Yemen in the southwestern corner of the peninsula. It is the source from which the ancestors of the modern Arabs migrated, and its ruins give evidence that great kingdoms once existed in its mountains. Today this ancient land is seeking to develop its resources and to modernize its cities. A concession was granted in 1955 to an American company to explore for minerals. The Imam has also been tempted by liberal offers of aid from the Soviet bloc, and Soviet and satellite experts have recently begun to arrive. The Soviet assistance has included at least one shipment of satellite arms sought by the Imam to strengthen Yemen in its dispute with the British over the Aden Protectorate.

The Aden Protectorate was formed through a series of treaties by which the British maintain political control over some 40 minor principalities in the hinterlands to the north and the east of the Crown Colony of Aden. An unsettled border between these principalities and Yemen, tribal difficulties in the area, and Yemeni claims to much of the Protectorate have resulted in spasmodic outbursts of violence along the border. Recently, these have increased in severity, although there is hope that talks may take place between the two parties which will lessen the current tension.

To the east of Aden lies the Hadhramaut, a highland area which was the ancient source of frankincense and myrrh. This also forms a part of the Aden Protectorate, but its ties, strangely enough, are primarily with India, where many of its people have gone as merchants.

In the southeastern corner of the peninsula lies Muscat and Oman, a little known independent principality with which the United States has had very long relations. One of the first treaties signed by the United States in Asia was with the Sultan of Muscat in 1832. The United States had a consulate in Muscat for over 60 years and, in view of the importance of the area, is now considering the reestablishment of a post there.

To the north lies a series of small principalities under British protectorate known as the Trucial States, named from the truce arrangements made with these states in the 19th century in order to halt attacks by pirates on British ships in the Persian Gulf. One of the Trucial States, Abu Dhabi, together with the Sultan of Muscat, is involved in a dispute with Saudi Arabia over the sovereignty of a key transportation and trade center in southeastern Arabia, the Buraimi oasis. The United States has exercised informal good offices seeking a solution to this problem and is hopeful that, when diplomatic relations are again established between Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom, which represents these two states, further talks can be held.

On the western shores in the Persian Gulf are three states which are better known to the world because of their oil resources. The largest and richest is Kuwait at the north end of the Gulf, where oil production exceeds that of any other state in the Middle East. The Shaikh of Kuwait was recently described as the biggest oil man of them all. Kuwait, like the other two states, Bahrein and Qatar, is bound by treaty relationship to the United Kingdom, which provides for their foreign affairs and defense.

This vast peninsula has been thrust into prominence not only by fabulous resources but by the important role its leaders are beginning to play in the events of the area. We can anticipate that in the days to come the strange names of places and people will become increasingly known and important to us in the developing United States relationships to the peoples of the Middle East.

Iraq lies at the northeast corner of the Arabian peninsula and links it with Iran and South Asia. Iraq has been the one Arab nation which has participated in Western-sponsored collective security arrangements. It has been genuinely concerned with the Communist threat and seeks United States assistance to strengthen its defenses.



Prime Minister Nuri Al-Said has since 1932 been the iron man of Iraqi politics and has led the country in significant economic and social development. Recent events have tested the stability of the Iraqi Government, but its anti-Communist stand and friendship with the United States have not been impaired. We have provided Iraq with substantial assistance, mostly military, to assist it in preserving its security and stability.

#### **The Northern Tier**

The Arabian peninsula and the Palestine area are insulated against the direct thrust of Communist imperialism by two very important nations—Turkey and Iran. These two, together with Iraq and Pakistan, have consistently demonstrated their confidence in the principle of collective security and form a bulwark against Soviet penetration.

Shortly after World War II, the Soviet Union sought to gain a military foothold in northern Iran and to establish a puppet government there. The Soviet Union was forced to withdraw by Iran's strong protests and by pressures exerted by the United Nations, with the United States playing a leading role. Parallel with these pressures on Iran the Soviet Union resumed its traditional attempts to force Turkey into yielding control over the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus. Aggressive Soviet actions in Turkey and Greece were successfully met and overcome by the military and economic support furnished under United States policies adopted in 1947.

Turkey and Pakistan were among the first states in the Middle East to work actively for the realization of collective defense in the Middle East. In April 1954 they signed an agreement of cooperation and consultation, followed in February 1955 by the conclusion of an agreement with similar objectives between Turkey and Iraq. The latter agreement, to which Pakistan, Great Britain, and Iran eventually adhered, is familiarly known as the Baghdad Pact, and it represents the most effective step thus far taken by the nations of the Middle East to fill the deficit of power in that troubled area.

Not only have Turkey and Pakistan taken the initiative in the Middle East. Each is contributing to the collective defense of a wider area, Turkey as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Pakistan as an original signatory of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

In short, these countries have shown in a variety of ways that they share with us certain basic assumptions about the need for collective measures of defense to deter aggression by international communism. This fact, as much as any other, has helped shape the close relations that exist between the United States and these nations of the "northern tier." The United States has extended military and economic aid to Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan for some years, the total amount being well over \$2 billion. United States aid has helped them achieve significant economic gains while at the same time strengthening the effectiveness of their military defenses. These countries are important allies to the United States. Their independence and stability are of major interest to us.

#### **Independent Libya**

On the western flank of the Middle East is Libya, a relatively new country strategically placed in North Africa. The United States has supported and assisted Libya on political, economic, and military fronts from the first day of its independence in 1951. In 1949 we joined a large majority of the members of the U.N. General Assembly in approving a resolution calling for Libya's independence prior to January 1, 1952. Under authority of this resolution, Libya declared itself free and independent on December 24, 1951.

Of the total Libyan revenues of \$30 million in fiscal year 1956, \$12 million, or 40 percent, will be U.S. aid. Our surplus agricultural products, valued at approximately \$10 million since January 1954, have played an important role in alleviating hunger and preventing famine conditions in Libya. United States technical assistance to Libya since fiscal year 1954 has totaled almost \$7 million. In addition, the United States has contributed over 50 percent of all funds expended by the United Nations for technical assistance in the country.

Under terms of the Mutual Security Act, the United States has programed military assistance for Libya and will equip a 1,000-man increment of the Libyan Army.

Libyan foreign policy has shown a marked friendliness to the United States and a growing understanding and appreciation of the threat of international communism. By agreement with Libya, the United States operates a major air base at Wheelus Field, near Tripoli. In 1956



Libya turned down Soviet offers of economic and military assistance but permitted establishment of diplomatic relations. Libya also evicted the Egyptian Embassy's military attaché last fall for activities considered inimical to Libyan sovereignty.

We are proud of the progress being made by Libya and happy that we are able to assist. The orderly development of the new states of Africa to political stability and economic well-being is a source of gratification.

#### Major Elements of U.S. Policy

The main purpose of this examination of the individual countries and specific problems of the Middle East has been to define the situations we are working with and to point up the major elements of our policies. To understand the really critical problems being headlined today, it is essential to have a good grasp of the background and the ramifications of the issues affecting the whole area.

Where do we stand on these really critical problems? I want to refer in particular to the Arab-Israeli dispute, the Suez Canal, and Soviet efforts to penetrate the region.

The Arab-Israeli issue has been a United Nations problem from its very beginning. We are hopeful that the United Nations will remain the forum because we believe that the nations involved are responsive to the ideals of peace with justice. Prior to the events of last October and November, the tempo of events had been building to fever pitch. We had recognized that President Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal Company and, more particularly, the manner in which this was announced had provoked the British and French and alarmed the Israelis. But at the same time we were convinced that the type of action they chose to take in the last days of October and the early days of November was in error. Furthermore, and more importantly, the painstaking beginnings which had been made through the United Nations toward the establishment of a system of world order were being jeopardized by this resort to force when the possibilities of negotiations had not been completely exhausted.

In the historic debates which took place in the United Nations around the clock through those crowded days of early November it became clear that there was a realization that a large portion of the responsibility for the situation which had

arisen rested upon the United Nations for its failure to come to grips with the basic problems which lay at the root of the conflict. The United States emphasized its intention to take advantage of this fluidity in the situation by introducing two resolutions on November 3<sup>2</sup> in the United Nations General Assembly which revealed our determination to come to grips with the basic issues.

Out of this debate came a very significant action. The United Nations was enabled to create a force in being, the United Nations Emergency Force, in record time. For years the possibility of establishing a United Nations police force to enforce decisions of the United Nations had been debated in a desultory fashion, but it too had become a casualty of the cold war until the crisis created in the Middle East made the members put aside their hesitation. The UNEF under its present authority has a limited mission—to oversee the withdrawal of British, French, and Israeli forces from Egypt—and it is in Egypt with the agreement of the Egyptian Government. This phase of its mission has now largely been completed, but there is earnest consideration being given, under a resolution of February 2,<sup>3</sup> to authorizing the force in being to act as a deterrent to the resumption of hostilities and as a means of tranquilizing the area while new approaches are sought toward an eventual settlement. The principle which was at stake was the authority of the United Nations and its ability to take a constructive and fair approach in creating and maintaining conditions under which the conflict of national interests between the parties concerned could be worked out.

To enable this situation to move forward along the lines which all the members of the United Nations except the Soviet bloc seemed to desire, it was a prerequisite that the Israelis withdraw from Egypt without having achieved political advantages which Israel did not possess before it invaded Egypt. On the other hand, Israel had some very legitimate and genuine concerns for its own security, particularly regarding free passage through the Straits of Tiran and the danger of renewed fedayeen raids from the Gaza Strip. These two aspects of the problem have now been fully brought to the attention of the world public, and a number of states, led by the United States, have made unilateral declarations of their own

<sup>2</sup> U.N. docs. A/3272 and 3273.

<sup>3</sup> BULLETIN of Feb. 25, 1957, p. 327.

policy in regard to these issues. These have, in turn, enabled Israel to withdraw in the confidence that the world community would now earnestly direct its attention to remedying the conditions which led to the outbreak of the conflict.

The Suez Canal problem, which became linked in its latter stages with the question of Israel withdrawal, is also essentially a problem for the United Nations. The only existing unanimously approved agreement by all the parties concerned is embodied in the Security Council resolution of October 13, 1956,<sup>4</sup> which sets forth the six principles under which the parties concerned agree to work out a final arrangement for the future operation of the canal. The prospects of the canal being opened in the near future under an interim operating arrangement without prejudicing the final settlement seem favorable. The difficulties of working out detailed implementation of the six principles should by no means be discounted. But in the light of the new determination of the United Nations and the persistent and tireless efforts of Secretary-General Hammarskjöld to find a solution which can be accepted by all the parties, the United States is convinced its best hope for achieving the objectives of the free world in this respect lie within the United Nations.

#### **Irresponsible Behavior of Soviet Union**

The record of the events of the last 6 months in the Middle East reveals a high degree of irresponsible behavior by the Soviet Union. The repeated attempts to take advantage of this situation to achieve political profit with the Arabs or to exercise pressure upon Israel, Britain, and France after they had already agreed to withdraw from this ill-fated adventure, besides the obvious purpose of distracting attention from their brutal attack on Hungary, can lead one to conclude only that the Soviet Union's objectives in the area are to weaken it to the maximum extent possible and to keep it in a constant state of turmoil and chaos.

To deal with this problem, which relates to the area as a whole, we have devised the Middle East plan or American Doctrine for the Middle East as embodied in the message of President Eisenhower to the Congress of January 5, 1957.<sup>5</sup> The plan aims to do three things, each of them with the consent of the states involved. First, if the states of

the area wish it, we are prepared to strengthen their internal security and their legitimate national self-defense through the extension of military aid. Secondly, if the states of the area desire it, we are prepared to cooperate with them in economic projects designed to raise the standards of living and strengthen the stability of the countries, thereby diminishing the attractiveness of grandiose offers of economic aid from the Soviets designed to promote subversion. And thirdly, we are prepared to use the armed forces of the United States to prevent direct overt aggression by forces controlled by international communism.

This proposal has now received strong support from the Congress of the United States and the endorsement of a large majority of the representatives of the American people. Ambassador James Richards left 2 days ago<sup>6</sup> to travel throughout this area, to explain to the various governments just precisely in what ways the American Doctrine for the Middle East could assist them in strengthening their ability to remain free and independent, and to work out recommendations which would be conducive to that end.

In our judgment the major threat to the Middle East is represented by the forces of international communism, and we feel deeply that we must never lose sight of this danger. The United States has a vital stake in keeping the Middle East from falling under Soviet domination. Indeed we must not allow the situation there to deteriorate to a point where the nations of the area in desperation would turn to the Soviet Union for help. While internal quarrels may engage our emotions and loyalties, we must not permit these factors to influence our exercise of great and grave responsibility as a leader of the free-world nations or to color the sense of justice and friendly impartiality which is so deeply rooted in the traditions of the American people.

We are taking important and constructive measures in the Middle East. The problems ahead are, to say the least, formidable and will require the very best diplomacy of which we are capable. Nevertheless, progress has been made.

We of the Department of State thank Georgetown University and the International Relations Enquiry for this chance to talk with you. We shall watch with interest the following discussions in this series on the Middle East.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, Oct. 22, 1956, p. 616.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, Jan. 21, 1957, p. 83.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, Mar. 25, 1957, p. 481.

## United States Replies to Soviet Proposal for Declaration on Middle East

Press release 131 dated March 11

*Following is the text of a note delivered by U.S. Chargé d'Affaires Richard H. Davis to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Andrei Gromyko, at Moscow, March 11, 1957, in reply to a Soviet note of February 11, 1957, concerning the Middle East. The British and French Governments also replied to the Soviet note on March 11.*

### U.S. NOTE OF MARCH 11

The Embassy of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and, on instructions of its Government, has the honor to transmit the following communication in reply to the Ministry's note of February 11, 1957 concerning the Middle East area.

It is noted that the Government of the U.S.S.R. proposes that the Governments of the United States, United Kingdom, France and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics should, jointly or separately, proclaim basic principles governing their relations with countries of the Middle East.

In dealing with this proposal, the United States Government deems it essential to set forth the following considerations:

The United States adheres and will continue to adhere to the principles of the United Nations Charter in its dealings with countries in the Middle East as elsewhere. Along with the other principles of the Charter, it fully supports those singled out in the Ministry's note—peaceful settlement of disputes; non-interference in internal affairs; respect for sovereignty and independence. It is ready to cooperate with any country, great or small, sincerely dedicated to carrying them out. The United States Government feels obliged, however, to point out that the Soviet Union could demonstrate its own willingness to carry out the high principles it sets forth by itself respecting

those U.N. resolutions addressed to the U.S.S.R. calling for compliance by the U.S.S.R., such as those relating to its actions with respect to Hungary. Great Britain and France, the other recipients of the Soviet proposal, have just made such a demonstration as a contribution to world order in fully complying with United Nations resolutions regarding the withdrawal of their forces from Egypt.

The form which cooperation in the Middle East should take—with specific reference to the proposal of the Soviet Government—is a matter for decision in consultation with the Middle Eastern states. Because of its respect for the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other nations, the United States would not wish to be party to an attempt by the great powers, as suggested by the U.S.S.R., to arrogate to themselves decisions on matters of vital importance to the nations of the Middle East; or to prevent those who feel themselves threatened from association of their own free will with other nations in legitimate collective security arrangements, in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter. When it comes, therefore, to such matters as military "blocs", the liquidation of foreign bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops, set forth in the principles proposed by the U.S.S.R., the United States Government must point out that the Middle Eastern states are fully capable of deciding what cooperative efforts are required to enable them to play their part in the defense of the area.

The principles in the Soviet note include a call for renunciation of arms shipments to the Middle East. With regard to this point, the United States Government wishes to make clear that it has consistently recognized a need on the part of the Middle Eastern states to maintain a certain level of armed forces to assure their internal security and legitimate self-defense and to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole. The United States has also consistently sought to avoid an



arms race between the Arab states and Israel. In carrying out its policy with regard to the export of arms to the Middle East, the United States Government has always kept in mind the need to encourage stability and foster progress toward lasting peace and security there. It therefore regrets that the Soviet Government, on the contrary, saw fit to effect massive shipments of arms into the area at a time when regional disputes there had become sharply exacerbated.

Finally, the Ministry's note talks of economic cooperation to be carried out, it states, without any conditions incompatible with the dignity and sovereignty of these countries. The Soviet Government ought to be aware that the United States provides, and will continue to provide, economic assistance only to those Middle Eastern states requesting it. No attempt is, or will be, made to force this assistance on any state, or through it to seek to impose conditions upon the countries concerned. There is no basis, therefore, for considering the acceptance of such assistance incompatible with national dignity and sovereignty.

The Soviet proposal, as a whole, is clearly based on a false premise. It stems, presumably, from the distorted interpretation of the nature and purpose of United States policies contained in the Ministry's note.

Contrary to this interpretation, President Eisenhower's outline of United States policy toward the Middle East envisages genuine practical efforts directed toward consolidating peace and security there in full cooperation with the Middle Eastern countries concerned. These efforts are designed to make a full contribution to economic progress in the area and to help the countries there maintain their independence.

Also, there is cause for considerable doubt as to the seriousness of the Soviet Government's invitation to the Government of the United States to join it in cooperation in the Middle East. It has been put forward at a time when certain Soviet official acts and statements suggest that the U.S.S.R. neither desires nor expects such cooperation. In fact, on the day following the delivery of its call for cooperation in the Middle East, the U.S.S.R. engaged once more in vilification of the United States by introducing into the United Nations a spurious item attacking this Government's policies in that area. This followed a similar baseless Soviet item distorting United States poli-

cies toward Eastern Europe.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, there is much reason to question whether the cooperation proffered by the U.S.S.R. is intended to further a mutually desired aim.

On its part, the United States will continue to work toward peace and greater stability in the Middle East through the United Nations and through measures taken at the request of, and in cooperation with, the states in the area themselves. It would like to be able to hope that the Soviet Union would make its own contribution to tranquillity there. The United States naturally desires to see friendly relations, based on mutual respect and confidence, develop not only among the Middle Eastern states but also between them and countries outside the area, including the U.S.S.R. However, as elsewhere, this largely depends on the U.S.S.R. itself. If the U.S.S.R. will indeed conduct itself in a manner conforming to the principles it proposes, it will be moving in this direction and not only make a contribution to peace in the Middle East but in other areas as well.

#### SOVIET NOTE OF FEBRUARY 11

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics expresses its respects to the Embassy of the United States of America and upon the instructions of the Soviet Government has the honor to communicate the following:

As a result of the efforts of the peace-loving peoples, supported by the United Nations, the aggressive actions against Egypt were liquidated, and favorable circumstances have developed and real possibilities have been created for insuring peace and also for settling international problems in the region of the Near and Middle East.

The liquidation of the hot-bed of war in this region created prerequisites for strengthening national independence, governmental sovereignty and economic development not only of Egypt but of all countries of the Near and Middle East, and also opened the way for broad cooperation of countries of this region with all countries on principles of equality among states, formulated in particular in the decisions of the Bandung Conference.

The peace-loving peoples justly expected that henceforth peace in the Near and Middle East would be preserved and strengthened, that an end would be placed to the policy of foreign intervention in the internal affairs of the countries of this region, that the sovereignty and

<sup>1</sup> For a statement by Senator Knowland on the Soviet item on alleged U.S. intervention in Eastern Europe, see BULLETIN of Mar. 18, 1957, p. 463.



independence of the countries of the Near and Middle East would be sincerely respected and that the countries of this region, especially the victim of aggression—Egypt—would be given unselfish economic assistance.

However, the period of softening of the tense situation in this region, regrettably, turned out to be of short duration and the hopes of the peoples were not realized.

As a result of the unilateral moves on the part of some powers, the situation in the Near and Middle East in the recent past has again become seriously exacerbated. This exacerbation is evoked first of all by the fact that there are intentions to utilize in a unilateral manner in the Near and Middle East without the agreement of the United Nations, armed forces of one of the great powers at its own discretion for intervention in the internal affairs of this region. There is also in view the granting of so-called economic assistance to countries of the Near and Middle East, foisting on them conditions that these countries reject any kind of ties with specific states—members of the United Nations—that is, with the acceptance of political conditions for this "assistance" incompatible with the dignity and sovereignty of these countries and with the high principles of the United Nations.

It is impossible not to recognize that implementation of such a policy in circumvention of the United Nations would lead to a new dangerous exacerbation of the situation in this region, which only recently was an arena of military operations evoked by aggression against Egypt, and would threaten the cause of world peace.

The mentioned plans are nothing other than a continuation of the policy of creating closed aggressive military blocs of the type of NATO, SEATO, and the Baghdad Pact and erection of artificial economic and political barriers interfering with normal ties among states.

The principle of peaceful coexistence of states regardless of differences in their social and state systems is the basis of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. It is known that in establishing its friendly relations with the Arab States the Soviet Union not only never sought deterioration of relations with these countries with other great powers, but on the contrary came out for the necessity of wide international cooperation, came out for the necessity of guaranteeing durable peace and creating an atmosphere of trust in the region of the Near and Middle East. The Soviet Union does not have and does not aspire to have military bases and any concessions in the Near and Middle East countries for the purpose of extracting profits and does not aspire to receive any privileges in this region, since all this is incompatible with the principles of Soviet foreign policy.

The Soviet Union is vitally interested that peace exists in the region of the Near and Middle East, situated in the immediate vicinity of its borders. It is sincerely interested in strengthening the independence of the countries of this region and in their economic prosperity.

In the opinion of the Soviet Government, preservation of peace in the Near and Middle East is a necessary condition not only for the development of Near and Middle East countries, but also, as recent events have demonstrated, for providing for the economic welfare of many other countries.

The necessity of consolidating peace and security in the Near and Middle East demands broad development of political, economic, and cultural ties between all countries, particularly of joint actions, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, of great powers who bear basic responsibility for the maintenance of peace.

The Soviet Government considers that it would be possible to secure firm and lasting peace in this region by means of joint efforts of the great powers—the U.S.S.R., U.S.A., England, and France, permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, if all the above-mentioned great powers built their relations with the Near and Middle East countries on the basis of general principles of a policy of non-intervention in their internal affairs and respect for their national independence and sovereignty.

Proceeding from the foregoing, the Soviet Government proposes to the Governments of the United States of America, England, and France, to draw up and proclaim basic principles concerning the question of peace and security in the Near and Middle East, and of non-intervention in the internal affairs of this region. These principles could be laid down as a basis of a joint declaration, acceptance of which would exclude the possibility of a dangerous unilateral action of this or that great power in respect to the Near and Middle East countries and would help to strengthen peace and security in this most important region, to develop national economies, and to consolidate the independence of these countries.

It goes without saying that the declaration would be open to adherence by any government interested in peace and security which desires to build relations with the Near and Middle East countries on the basis of the principles mentioned.

The proposals concerning the corresponding obligations of the participant powers of the declaration could be immediately brought to the attention of the governments and peoples of the Near and Middle East countries.

In transmitting herewith the basic theses of a draft declaration of the four powers—U.S.S.R., U.S.A., England, and France, proposed by the Government of the U.S.S.R., the Ministry of Foreign Affairs would be grateful to the Embassy of the United States of America for informing it regarding the acceptability to the Government of the United States of America of the basic principles presented in this draft of the declaration concerning the question of peace and security in the Near and Middle East and non-intervention in the internal affairs of the countries of this region.

The Soviet Government would also have no objections if the Governments of the United States of America, England, France, and the Soviet Union issued separate declarations, identical in content and based on the principles set forth in the enclosed draft, on their relations with the Near and Middle East countries.

(Attachment)

#### DRAFT DECLARATION

Draft of the basic principles of the declarations by the Governments of the U.S.S.R., the United States, Britain, and France regarding the question of peace and security

in the Near and Middle East and noninterference in the internal affairs of the countries of this region.

*Moscow, February 11, 1957.*

The basic principles of the declaration by the Governments of the U.S.S.R., the United States, Britain, and France on the questions of peace and security in the Near and Middle East and noninterference in the internal affairs of countries of this area:

The Governments of the U.S.S.R., the United States, the United Kingdom, and the French Republic, guided by lofty peace-loving aims and the principles of the United Nations expressed in its Charter, declare their agreement that at the basis of their policy in respect of the countries of the Near and Middle East lies the aspiration to establish peace and security in the Near and Middle East and in the whole world; acknowledge and respect the lofty principles of relations between states formulated at the Bandung Conference of Asian and African Countries; are striving to create favorable conditions for the strengthening of the national independence and national sovereignty of the countries of the Near and Middle East; express a sincere desire to contribute disinterestedly by common efforts to the economic development of the countries of this area, and are in this proceeding from the fact that the natural wealth of the underdeveloped countries is the inalienable national property of the peoples of these countries, which have the full right to dispose of and use it in the interests of the development of their national economy and progress.

The Governments of the U.S.S.R., the United States, Britain and France wish to contribute to the all-around development of economic, business, and cultural relations of the countries of the Near and Middle East on the basis of equality and mutual advantage for all countries. They are of the opinion that wide economic and trade relations of the countries of that area are in accordance not only with the interests of these countries but also with the interests of securing economic prosperity for other countries of the world. They recognize the need for a peaceful settlement of all international problems and questions relating to the Near and Middle East, by way of negotiations.

Being aware of the importance of the responsibility which they carry for the maintenance of peace and security throughout the world, the Governments of the U.S.S.R., the United States, Britain, and France pledge themselves to follow in their policy toward the Near and Middle East the principles stated below:

1—The preservation of peace in the Near and Middle East by settling outstanding questions exclusively by peaceful means and by the method of negotiations;

2—Noninterference in the internal affairs of Middle Eastern countries, and respect for their sovereignty and independence;

3—Renunciation of all attempts to involve these countries in military blocs with the participation of the Great Powers;

4—Liquidation of foreign bases and withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of Middle Eastern countries;

5—Reciprocal refusal to deliver arms to Middle Eastern countries;

6—Promotion of the Middle Eastern nations' economic development without attaching any political, military, or other terms incompatible with the dignity and sovereignty of these countries.

The Governments of the U.S.S.R., the United States, Great Britain, and France express the hope that other states, in their relations with Middle Eastern countries, will adhere to the same principles.

## Ambassador Richards Leaves for Middle East

*Following is the text of a statement made by Ambassador James P. Richards, Special Assistant to the President, at Washington National Airport on March 12 on his departure for the Middle East.<sup>1</sup>*

Press release 132 dated March 11

President Eisenhower has asked me to visit the nations of the Middle East to present and discuss his proposals to promote peace, freedom, and economic well-being of the area. I feel honored by his request and undertake this mission with a sense of the very great responsibility it involves.

The President is seeking through this program to make an important contribution to the security and stability of the independent nations of the Middle East who wish our cooperation. I share his hope that full explanation and discussion of the program will demonstrate the close identity of interests between Middle Eastern countries and my own.

It is only natural that a new initiative such as the President's may not be completely understood in the first instance and may even be misinterpreted in some quarters. I shall try to remove such misunderstandings if any have arisen.

The determination of the United States to assist in the maintenance of the independence of free nations, including those of the Middle East, has been fully demonstrated. My colleagues and I begin this mission proudly conscious of recent American leadership giving practical effect to that determination.

The strong support of the Congress for the President's program once again gives assurance that the American people hold out a hand of

<sup>1</sup> For background, see BULLETIN of Mar. 25, 1957, p. 480.

friendship to the historic lands and peoples of the Middle East. It is the American hope that all governments will work actively for freedom and stability in a peaceful world.

In keeping with the spirit of the President's proposals, discussions will be held only with governments who wish them, and we will not try to force our views upon others. The President and I do not look upon this mission as the inauguration of a vast new aid program. We do believe

that the greater flexibility which the Congress has approved in the use of funds will enable us to undertake some new and more effective programs which will materially contribute to the strengthening of the area.

In our preparation for this important mission, we have deeply appreciated the support and good wishes of the American people and of those in other lands. Our inspiration and our purpose are strong. We shall do our best.

## Third Meeting of the Council of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization

*Following is the text of the final communique issued at the close of the third annual meeting of the Council of Ministers of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, held at Canberra, Australia, March 11 to 13, together with three statements made by Secretary Dulles at the meeting and the transcript of a news conference held by Secretary Dulles at Canberra on March 13.*

### FINAL COMMUNIQUE, MARCH 13

Press release 141 dated March 13

Plans to consolidate and enhance the progress made in preserving the freedom of all countries in Southeast Asia have been agreed to by the SEATO Council at its third meeting, held under the chairmanship of Mr. R. G. Casey, Minister for External Affairs of Australia.

These plans provide for:

Maintenance of the defensive capacity of Treaty members to deal effectively with armed aggression.

Extension of the program to detect, appraise, expose and combat subversion directed from without.

Development of the economic resources of Treaty members, particularly the Asian member states, by measures inside and outside SEATO.

### Defense Plans

The Ministers believe that while the immediate military threat to peace in Southeast Asia has diminished, the forces of international Communism are still working for the ultimate objective of world domination.

The Council noted that in Asia the Communist so-called peace front is in reality a front of millions of armed men. The military strength of Communist China and of North Viet-Nam is continually being increased.

In the circumstances the Council agreed that SEATO could not relax its vigilance and must maintain its capacity to deter and repel aggression. In the face of the threat which is not itself static, the SEATO nations by their united efforts are continually increasing and adapting their capacity to deal with it. If the Communists have chosen for tactical reasons to exert their pressure by other than military means for the present, this does not mean that they would not attempt to exploit any weakness in SEATO military preparedness if the opportunity came.

As a result of the work of the military advisers over the past year, SEATO Governments are agreed upon the nature of the Communist threat in the Treaty area and the kind of military measures which would be necessary to defeat it.

Military planning is a continuing process and

April 1, 1957

will be helped by the setting-up of a permanent military planning office at Bangkok with staff representing all member countries.

Close cooperation among the forces of the member countries is being assisted by realistic training exercises arranged by the SEATO military advisers.

#### **Anti-Subversion Program**

The Council believes that the military threat to the region is deterred by the very existence of SEATO and the collective defense represented by its members. The emphasis in Communist and Communist-inspired tactics in the area has therefore continued to move from the open threat of force to more flexible tactics of non-violent penetration and undermining of non-Communist states still accompanied in some cases by armed insurrection.

Believing that public knowledge of these tactics—of how and where subversion is occurring—is an essential prerequisite of effective action against them, the Council agreed to direct its civil organization to intensify its work of identifying all phases of subversive tactics; to make known its findings amongst member governments; and to expose them to the scrutiny of public opinion.

With this object the Council approved specific projects for the exposure of these activities. Basic material for these projects will come from analyses by the Committee of Security Experts and from information provided by the SEATO Research Service Center and by member governments. The Council recognized that in countering subversion the primary responsibility rests with each government, aided as necessary by its friends. But an important supplementary role can be played by SEATO, and decisions made by the Council at its present meeting will make that role more effective.

#### **Economic and Social Progress**

The Council discussed economic activities relating to Article III of the Treaty.<sup>1</sup> The representatives of Pakistan, the Philippines, and Thailand drew attention to the economic problems in their countries requiring cooperative action with other members, and the Council discussed what

were the most appropriate arrangements by which these problems might be resolved.

SEATO expert Committees have recommended specific projects to assist in relieving the economic burden of defense and to make a contribution towards the continuation of economic development under SEATO's protective shield. Council members undertook to consider the carrying out of these recommendations.

The Council noted with satisfaction the progress made in the economic development of Asian member states. The Council also noted that a number of countries, particularly the United States, were providing considerable economic assistance bilaterally as a direct contribution to treaty objectives. In addition to these bilateral programs, some assistance is being provided specifically under the auspices of SEATO. For example, the Australian Government is thus providing 2 million pounds.

The Council decided that SEATO cultural activities should include encouragement and assistance to national activity in this field. It urged member governments to foster bilateral cultural exchanges within the SEATO Community.

In addition the Council approved a number of multilateral projects in the cultural relations field.

This is a new and promising development which will strengthen the spirit of friendship which already marks the relations between the eight SEATO member countries. A major cultural project approved for immediate introduction is a SEATO fellowship program under which scholars of SEATO countries will be encouraged to undertake study and research in fields of special interest to SEATO.

Another important project adopted is the convening in one of the Asian member countries, of a "Round Table" meeting, consisting of outstanding authorities, in order to discuss Asian civilizations and cultures.

The Council also adopted a French proposal that the competent bodies of SEATO should consider the problem of educational assistance in the Treaty area and recommend measures applicable in this field within the framework of SEATO.

#### **Permanent Organization and Budget**

The Council considered the strengthening of the permanent civil organization in Bangkok and to that end decided to appoint a Secretary General

<sup>1</sup> For text, see BULLETIN of Sept. 20, 1954, p. 393.



and a Deputy Secretary General. They directed the Council Representatives to determine the terms of reference of these officers and the timing of the appointments and to consider and report on nominations from member governments for these posts.

The Council approved a budget of \$787,145 for the fifteen months ending June 30, 1958 to cover the cost of their permanent civil and military headquarters in Bangkok and to help finance certain joint programs.

#### **Final Observations**

Among the topics discussed by the Council was that of neutralism.

It was observed with concern that some governments have in varying degrees adopted a line of active opposition to collective security arrangements such as SEATO which are in full accord with the Charter of the United Nations.

It was hoped that as time passed and the value of SEATO became more widely appreciated that those who criticized it today would eventually be willing to welcome it. SEATO is not an exclusive organization but remains open to all those countries in Southeast Asia who are willing to share its benefits and responsibilities. The Council members wish to stress that it was genuine concern for the security of the area which led to their voluntary association in SEATO; all nations of the area whether members of SEATO or not, are benefiting from the protection provided by SEATO's collective deterrent strength.

The members of the Council recorded their abhorrence at the use of Soviet forces to crush the struggle by the Hungarian people for independence. They noted that the Soviet action was condoned and supported by Communist China. They noted the vivid and revealing contrast provided by the policies of certain member governments, which have already led or are now leading to full independence in various hitherto dependent territories.

The Council met in an atmosphere of great friendship, understanding and mutual trust. As the organization moves into its new and expanded phase of activity, the Council members are determined that SEATO will work for the enrichment as well as the defense of human life and liberty in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.

The representatives attending the Third SEATO

Council Meeting were: Australia - Rt. Hon. R. G. Casey; France - M. Pierre de Nelice; New Zealand - Hon. T. L. MacDonald; Pakistan - Mr. S. Amjad Ali; Philippines - Vice President Carlos P. Garcia; Thailand - Mr. Rak Panyarachun; United Kingdom - Rt. Hon. The Earl of Home; United States - Hon. John Foster Dulles.

#### **STATEMENT BY SECRETARY DULLES AT OPENING SESSION, MARCH 11**

Press release 128 dated March 11

It is a great satisfaction for me to serve for the third time as the United States representative at the annual conference of the SEATO Council. It is appropriate that we thus come together to take stock of our strength in the vital SEATO area. We are happy to be able to do this in the hospitable land of Australia.

During the 3 years since our defensive treaty was signed, SEATO has proven a strong bulwark. It has contributed greatly to the relative peace and security which all the member nations now enjoy. SEATO is an effective force against aggression and subversion. This fact has encouraged constructive developments in many fields. The increased stability in the treaty area is fully evident.

One notable example is the unity and strength developed by the Republic of Viet-Nam. A serious problem does, however, remain in Laos, where, despite the Geneva armistice agreement, international communism continues to support the Pathet Lao insurgents. The Republic of Korea, Japan, and the Republic of China are outside the treaty area, but there is an interlocking connection with them because the United States does have collective defense treaties with these other free Asian nations. It may therefore be relevant to report that there is growing strength in each of these three other free nations.

Political progress within our treaty area is attested by the fact that the Federation of Malaya will soon achieve full independence. With respect to Singapore, amiable and fruitful discussions are now in progress. During the period of SEATO's existence, the free countries of the area have conducted orderly elections on a nationwide basis and have been able to implement their ideals of universal suffrage and free elections.

Substantial social and economic progress has

**April 1, 1957**

420297-57-3

**529**

been made by all member states. A broad interchange of visits by officials, as between the free Asian countries, has served to create new bonds of friendship and understanding. Useful interchanges have also taken place between the free Asian nations and the West. I recently had the pleasure of receiving in my offices the 1,000th Thai to come to the United States under the technical training program conducted by our International Cooperation Administration.<sup>2</sup> By such interchanges in their lands and ours, the American people learn much about the ancient culture and the modern aspirations of free Asian nations. I hope in turn that they learn something of value from us and that it will serve both to advance their own professional careers and to contribute to the happiness and well-being of their peoples.

United States cooperation with our Asian partners continues through bilateral arrangements for economic aid, technical assistance, and cultural exchange. These include our recent program of SEATO cultural grants.<sup>3</sup> Also of help is our membership in the Colombo Plan and ECAFE [Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East], and our bilateral agreements of sharing knowledge and materials for the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Plans for an Asian Nuclear Center located at Manila are being actively studied by the Colombo Plan nations with assurance of substantial United States support, both technical and financial.

Our mutual security pacts, including SEATO, are other manifestations of the same intent. And let there be no doubt in any quarter—be it friendly or hostile—that the American Nation is united in its determination to respond to our obligations under these pacts. Also that determination is backed by power in being and in useful places.

#### **Beyond the Treaty Area**

We need, however, also to look beyond the confines of our own treaty area. Events elsewhere have been dramatic and instructive. Since we last met, it has been demonstrated beyond a doubt that the materialistic rule of communism will never meet the aspirations with which human beings are endowed by their Creator.

<sup>2</sup> For an exchange of correspondence between President Eisenhower and the Prime Minister of Thailand, see BULLETIN of Mar. 18, 1957, p. 442.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Mar. 25, 1957, p. 503.

Within the Soviet Union, the rulers have had to disavow Stalin's brand of communism. They have had to move, even though slowly, toward granting their people greater personal security, greater freedom of thought and of conscience, and greater enjoyment of the fruits of their labor. Within Poland and Hungary, 12 years of indoctrination have failed to persuade the youth that the Soviet system satisfies either national or their individual desires. Throughout the satellite area, there is revulsion against the brutal colonialism and exploitation of Soviet imperialism. We can confidently conclude from this that international communism now imposed upon many of the peoples of Asia is a passing and not a permanent phase.

On the other hand, developments elsewhere reveal characteristics which should keep us on guard. When the people's revolt in Hungary could not be subdued by the Red Army forces already there, Hungary was openly invaded and overrun by Soviet divisions, spearheaded by tanks. They ruthlessly slaughtered the people of Hungary who were manifesting their desire of freedom. The Soviet rulers did this in defiance of repeated calls from the United Nations that the Soviet desist from this armed attack upon another member state in violation of the charter.

In the Middle East, the Soviet rulers have persistently sought to foment trouble. Whenever it seemed that the difficulties in the area might be peacefully composed, the Soviets have intervened and by vicious propaganda and by large-scale arms shipments sought to set the peoples of the area against each other. All of this again is in clear defiance of their obligations to seek the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law.

We must keep indelibly clear in our minds that international communism is not regardful of legality or of humanity or of the moral force of world opinion as reflected in the General Assembly of the United Nations. For these reasons it is at most but a transient if painful episode in the history of mankind.

The open support given by the Communist Chinese to Soviet colonialism and imperialism and to Soviet defiance of the United Nations has ominous implications for all free Asian nations. These actions give us all ample warning of the true nature of the Chinese Communist regime. They also

emphasize the continuing importance of the military side of SEATO, of the work of our military advisers and of our combined military planning. All of this has been highly effective.

#### **Avoiding Communist Traps**

A year ago at Karachi I stated that the success of our trade, aid, and cultural exchange programs was producing imitators.<sup>4</sup> These imitators, I said, would use such programs for completely different purposes. Our purpose is to build up the free nations. Their purpose would be to destroy freedom and independence.

I also predicted that the free Asian leaders who had shown great political skill in winning independence for their countries would readily distinguish between liberty and tyranny. They would do so even though tyranny went about disguised in the pilfered clothes of liberty. I do not think any of the free Asian leaders have been deceived. Some may not yet be fully aware of the danger from the numerous underground forces which the Communist conspirators traditionally use. However, in various free Asian countries there is already evidence of official action to counter Communist penetration of schools, trade unions, and minority groups. These are encouraging beginnings in meeting a large-scale and growing threat.

We who are members of SEATO may gain influence beyond the treaty area as we ourselves set a good example. Let us put our own houses in order. Let us avoid Communist traps baited with offers of trade and aid. Let us expose Communist techniques of subversion. Let us make economic and social progress. Let us build up our educational systems. Let us give fair treatment to minority groups. Let us train capable trade-union leaders. Thus we can do much to show other free nations how to seal off effectively the various traditional avenues of Communist penetration.

The several SEATO committees have done much planning to assist member nations toward this end. I congratulate all who have taken part in laying this groundwork for SEATO activities and cooperation in many fields. In the months and years ahead those plans need to be put into effect and enlarged. I am sure that in these meetings here at Canberra we shall contribute strongly to this achievement.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, Mar. 19, 1956, p. 449.

#### **STATEMENT BY SECRETARY DULLES ON U.S. CHINA POLICY, MARCH 12**

Press release 138 dated March 13

The United States adheres steadfastly to the three main aspects of its China policy, which is to recognize the Republic of China; not to recognize the so-called People's Republic of China; and to oppose the seating of this People's Republic in the United Nations as the accredited representative of what the charter calls the Republic of China.

This policy is not merely an expression of emotional dislike of Chinese communism, although the creed and practices of the Chinese Communists are in fact repugnant to us. Also our policy is not merely an expression of sentimental loyalty to the Republic of China, although we do feel loyalty to a Government which was loyal to the Allied cause throughout even the darkest days of the Second World War.

Our policy stems primarily from considerations of national interest and, we believe, of international interest. First of all we ask ourselves: Will the interests of the United States be advanced by according diplomatic recognition to the Chinese Communist regime?

The answer to that is in our opinion clearly negative. United States diplomatic recognition of the Chinese Communist regime would serve no national purpose but would strengthen and encourage influences hostile to us and our allies and further imperil lands whose independence is related to our own peace and security.

In this connection we recall that there are many millions of immigrant Chinese who form parts of the populations of free Asian countries. Today many of them, perhaps most of them, remain loyal to the Republic of China now seated at Taiwan, which symbolizes the China that they know. We can see only loss and no gain in action which would make these overseas Chinese more apt to serve the subversive policies of the Chinese Communist regime.

If we examine this matter from the standpoint of the United Nations, we come to a similar conclusion. The United Nations would not be strengthened if the Communists were there to represent China, and we cannot see that they have any right to this role.

The charter seeks that membership should be made up of peace-loving governments able and

willing to carry out their obligations under the charter. There is no evidence that the Chinese Communist regime would represent China in the spirit envisaged by the charter. It has fought the United Nations in Korea and still stands condemned as an aggressor against the United Nations. It seized Tibet by force. It promoted the war in Indochina. It refuses to renounce resort to war as an instrument of its policy in relation to Taiwan and the Penghus. Its conduct toward other nations and their citizens does not reflect the tolerance and good neighborliness which the members of the United Nations are supposed to practice.

If the Communist regime were allowed to represent the Republic of China in the United Nations, it would presumably sit on the Security Council as a permanent member with veto power. That Council is the body which by the charter is entrusted with primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security in conformity with the principles of justice and international law. It would be grotesque if that high responsibility were to be conferred upon a regime which itself stands condemned as an armed aggressor against the United Nations and which itself is a most conspicuous violator of justice and international law.

The United Nations is faced with growing responsibilities. These could not be more readily discharged by giving the Chinese Communists the opportunity to work mischief there.

We believe that United States policies are not merely in our own interest and in the interest of the free world but also that they are in the interest of the Chinese people themselves, with whom the American people have historic ties of friendship.

#### **STATEMENT BY SECRETARY DULLES AT CLOSING SESSION, MARCH 13**

Press release 140 dated March 13

We have, I believe, every reason to be gratified with what has been accomplished during the 3 days of the SEATO Council meeting at Canberra. Inspired by the opening address of Prime Minister Menzies, we have gone on to adopt sound recommendations for expanded activities. These will promote the peace and security of the area by making the SEATO nations better able to counter in all its varied aspects the Communist threat.

These programs cover diverse fields, such as combined military-defense information programs, economic cooperation, and cultural exchange. But they all have a single purpose. Their aim is to strengthen spiritually and physically the peoples and nations who wish to resist the Communist menace and to pursue in freedom their individual and national aspirations. These manifold activities of SEATO require for their success a high degree of coordination. This will be promoted by the Secretary General and Deputy Secretary General, new positions which the Council here has agreed to establish.

I wish, Mr. Chairman, to express my appreciation and that of the entire United States delegation to our host, the Government of Australia, to you, Mr. Casey, our able chairman, and to the others here in Canberra who have done so much to make the Council meeting the success it has been. We recognize the enormous effort that goes into preparing for such an important meeting attended by so many people of different lands. We have been met on all sides by careful preparation, courtesy, cooperation, and good humor. It is the excellence of arrangements made for us here that has permitted us to accomplish so much in these 3 days.

These arrangements have a significance which goes far beyond the personal enjoyment of the delegates themselves. It contributes to the development of the friendship between our countries which, as Prime Minister Menzies pointed out, is one of the imponderable but most valuable assets of our association. In this connection, I am sure that my colleagues will wish to join me in asking the chairman to convey to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate our gratitude for their gracious hospitality and ask them to convey to the parliamentary staff and to Hansard our appreciation for their great assistance and the skill with which they have handled this important conference.

The success of this third Council meeting, like that of the previous two, also owes much to the various SEATO committees, the Council representatives, and the military advisers, who did such excellent work in preparing their reports and recommendations. Their conscientious efforts through the more than 2 years of SEATO's existence have made it possible for us to look forward each year with increased confidence in ourselves and in



our capacity to resist the varied forms of attack which we know are being made and will continue to be made against us by the Communists.

At this meeting we have again affirmed our belief that only through the exercise of what the United Nations Charter calls the inherent right of collective defense backed by adequate force can we expect to remain free. By constant vigilance and dedication to the high purposes expressed in our treaty and in the Pacific Charter, we can hope that in the coming year SEATO will contribute further to the peace and security not only of Southeast Asia but of the world. Thank you.

#### **SECRETARY DULLES' NEWS CONFERENCE, CANBERRA, MARCH 13**

Press release 144 dated March 14

*Secretary Dulles:* I am very happy to have a chance to meet with you for a few minutes. Our conference has just closed, and I shall be going back to Washington the first thing tomorrow morning. It has been, I think, a good conference. It has not been spectacular; it has been harmonious and in that respect perhaps it has not made much news, but from the standpoint of a member of the Council I would rather have it that way. We have built, I think, constructively, and I have the feeling more than ever before that SEATO is a real solid going concern. My feeling in that respect is somewhat increased perhaps by the fact that I am told that the Communist propaganda is attacking us very viciously and blaming all the evils of much of the world upon SEATO. That, at least, proves that we are not insignificant. I might say in reply that I think events of recent years have demonstrated beyond the possibility of doubt that the Communists try to make trouble where there is none and, if there is any anywhere, they try to make it worse. That has certainly been our experience during this last year. Now if you have any questions I would be glad to try to answer them.

*Q. Mr. Dulles, is it correct that under what is now known as the Eisenhower Doctrine, if one of the Middle East powers asked for military aid to protect them from armed aggression, the United States will give such aid?*

A. Well, there are three aspects of the so-called Eisenhower Doctrine. One is to assist the coun-

tries to build up their economies so they can be strong and independent. The second is to help them to develop their own defensive capabilities so that they will have a dependable security-defense force. And the third is, if they are attacked by a Communist-controlled country and if they want our assistance, the President is authorized to give it.

*Q. Mr. Dulles, the situation in the Middle East—do you see any alarming portents in the new developments there?*

A. Well, I would not like to answer that question because I am not fully up to date. I would prefer not to talk about the recent developments in that part of the world. Those are being handled—from the standpoint of the United States—being handled from Washington. And I am not kept fully informed, and I would prefer not to comment on the basis of inadequate information on what is obviously a delicate situation.

*Q. Mr. Dulles, could you answer a subsidiary question stemming from the first one?*

A. All right.

*Q. Why was it that the United States did not give military aid to Hungary when she appealed to the United States to protect her from Russia?*

A. Well, there was no basis for our giving military aid to Hungary. We had no commitment to do so, and we did not think that to do so would either assist the people of Hungary or the people of Europe or the rest of the world.

#### **U.S. Negotiations With the Philippines**

*Q. Mr. Dulles, has there been any progress in the United States negotiations with the Philippine Government on the question of American bases in the Philippines?*

A. There has been no recent progress made. The talks have been temporarily suspended. I expect that they will be resumed soon. The differences between us are, I think, not insurmountable, and I expect that there will be an amicable settlement, but at the moment the discussions are in suspension.

*Q. Mr. Secretary, the question I have been trying to ask is whether or not the events in the Middle East have caused any change in your plans to*

return home. You are still planning to stay overnight here and start back tomorrow morning?

A. Yes, I am going back according to schedule, going back tomorrow morning. I hope to spend a day at Honolulu and rest up, and I will be back in Washington on Saturday or Sunday and get ready for the Bermuda conference with Mr. Harold Macmillan, which will begin on Wednesday afternoon.

*Q. We should not put any significance to your leisurely trip tomorrow? You don't regard the Middle East situation as alarming?*

A. No, all I can say is that I am conscious that the people in Washington are perfectly able to take care of it.

*Q. That means you will miss the National Security Council meeting that is called for Thursday?*

A. They have them every Thursday; so, if I am ever absent on a Thursday, I miss that meeting.

*Q. I understand that this was specially called for the Middle East discussion.*

A. I don't think so. I think it is a regular Thursday meeting.

*Q. Mr. Dulles, is America introducing atomic weapons to Southeast Asia for SEATO defense in the area?*

A. No, not that I am aware of. We have atomic capabilities in our own mobile forces in the area, but they are confined, as far as I am aware, to our own forces.

*Q. Mr. Dulles, could you say why it is that President Eisenhower has not asked for authority to protect any European country against armed aggression?*

A. We have such authority in the North Atlantic Treaty. You see, we get the authority in any one of two ways. One is by a congressional resolution, and the other is by a treaty. A treaty becomes a law of the land in the same way that a congressional joint resolution becomes law of the land. So that we can operate in either of two ways, either under the treaty form, which is the case of Europe, or the joint resolution form, which is that adopted in the case of the Middle East.

*Q. Could I just ask you to explain why the United States, after suggesting the formation of the Baghdad Pact, subsequently withdrew from it?*

#### Baghdad Pact

A. Well, it would be hardly accurate to say we withdrew from it because we were never a member of the Baghdad Pact. We did suggest the desirability of an organization for security purposes of what I call the northern-tier countries. I made that suggestion after having been out there the first year I was Secretary of State some 4 years ago. We were very glad to see the Baghdad Pact formed. We are associated with it in many respects, and I hope will become even more closely associated with it without necessarily becoming a formal member of the treaty organization.

*Q. Mr. Dulles, in your opening address to the Council and those of the other Ministers, there was reference to the primary requirement of insuring the security of countries in South and Southeast Asia. Could you tell us how SEATO proposes to apply that to the Kashmir problem?*

A. Well, I am not sure that SEATO will interest itself in the Kashmir problem. I don't think that is a problem for SEATO. You will recall perhaps that the United States, at least in adhering to the SEATO treaty, said that the aggression with which we concerned ourselves was Communist aggression, and we limited our participation to that kind of aggression.

*Q. Would that be direct aggression, sir, or Communist-inspired aggression?*

A. I think that the actual language of the treaty is "Communist aggression."

*Q. Mr. Dulles, you are reported to have told the United States Congress on January 25 that an American soldier called upon to fight in the Middle East could "feel a lot safer" if he did not have British and French troops alongside him. What do you mean by that?*

A. I was referring to the fact that some of the Senators were suggesting that, if there were military operations in the area, they should be undertaken jointly with the British and the French. On the other hand, the United Nations had just called upon the British and the French to withdraw and had created the United Nations Emergency Force without participation by the British and the French. It did not seem to me under the circumstances it would be desirable for us to try to bring back the British and French forces into the area from which they had just retired as a result of the recommendations of the United Nations.

*Q. Mr. Dulles, is the United States putting off naming an American ambassador to the Philippines until after the elections there and, as a consequence, putting off the bases talks?*

A. No, I hope that we will be able to ask the *agrément*, as it is called, of the Philippine Government for the appointment of an ambassador shortly.

*Q. And who is that?*

A. We will have to tell the Government that first.

#### **Possibility of Sudden Communist Attack**

*Q. Mr. Dulles, would you feel that things are just as delicate in the Southeast Asia area as in the Middle East?*

A. I would say that there exists here about the same danger of Communist attack as there does in the Middle East. I spoke to that point somewhat this morning at the conference, pointing out the fact that the danger of attack from Communist-controlled countries can never be foreseen with any confidence. When it comes, if it comes, it will be because in the Communist type of dictatorship they can make their preparations in entire secrecy. There is no parliamentary situation to concern them, no public relations situation to concern them; there is no free press to concern them, and they can always act and, if they wish, strike in a way which will take us by surprise. Therefore, we must always be prepared and ready as long as they have the kind of military potential which they do have, and as long as they have the expansionist ambitions which they do have.

*Q. Mr. Dulles, what are you hoping will be the outcome of the Bermuda talks?*

A. Well, these talks are the kind of talks which we have periodically with the heads of other governments with whom we have many relations. There are always a series of these talks throughout each year, and there are a number of matters of common concern to the British and ourselves that we will talk over, and I think we will come to a better understanding between ourselves.

*Q. Is the United States concerned about the presence of Russians in Antarctica, and is the United States prepared to do anything about them?*

A. We are concerned about their presence there. In fact, we are concerned about their presence almost anywhere. I have had talks on that subject with your Prime Minister and your Foreign Minister. I think we want to be very careful that the Soviets, under the guise of the Geophysical Year, don't engage in activities which are not contemplated by the scientists who outlined that year.

*Q. Mr. Dulles, in view of what you just said about the danger of sudden Communist attack it would be possible legally for the United States to act immediately under the SEATO treaty if that attack occurred in this region?*

A. Yes, it would be.

*Q. Mr. Dulles, has the Australian viewpoint on Dutch New Guinea been put to you, and, if so, have you had any reaction to it?*

A. About New Guinea, no, we have not had any particular talks about that. I think the problem comes up annually at the United Nations. It came up again this year. I forget what the disposition was. But our position in that matter is well known. There is nothing new to develop on that.

#### **Middle East**

*Q. Mr. Dulles, do you feel that the United Nations should take a stronger line with Egypt, as it took with Israel?*

A. I think that we should try to stand for the principles of the charter, the principle that disputes should be settled by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law. That is the first article of the charter. We have tried to make that prevail as against Israel, and I believe we should also try to make it prevail as against Egypt.

*Q. Has the United States of America ever regretted its decision to cancel the loan to Egypt for the Aswan Dam?*

A. No, I think if anything events have confirmed that fact that it would not have been a wise operation for us to have tried to conduct together. That was a gigantic proposition which involved expenditures of probably a billion and a half dollars, by far the largest operation of the kind ever known in the history of the world. It

would have taken about 15 years of close association; it would have involved an austerity program on the part of Egypt which I think the people would have come to resent and would have blamed the foreigners who were the partners in the enterprise. The more we studied it, the more we came to the conclusion that it was not a suitable project for the United States and the United Kingdom, because they were in it also, to try to conduct with Egypt.

*Q. Do you think it hastened the seizure of the canal company by Egypt?*

A. Well, it is hard to say whether that hastened it or not. We now know from statements made by President Nasser and also made by President Tito that there had been plans to seize the Universal Canal Company made approximately 2 years before. The plans were all ready and this may have provided the occasion, but, if there had not been this occasion, I am quite sure another one would have been found.

*Q. Mr. Dulles, was it the hope of your Government when the United Nations first moved into the Gaza Strip that they would remain for some considerable time?*

A. We believe that it would be desirable to have the United Nations Emergency Force function as a barrier between Israel and the neighboring Arab countries. That has been difficult to work out, partly because Israel has not wanted to have any elements of the United Nations Force on the Israeli side of the boundary and Egypt has not wanted to have them exclusively on the Egyptian or Gaza Strip of the boundary. But I still hope something can be worked out there to give greater stability and tranquillity to the area and to put a stop to the raiding back and forth.

*Q. Did the Israeli Government agree to withdraw its forces on the assumption of the United Nations barrier?*

A. No, I would hardly say that, because Israel itself has been the principal obstacle to creating that barrier. As I pointed out, they have not wanted to have the United Nations forces actually on the boundary line.

*Q. Mr. Dulles, since the Philippines will not yield on this question of jurisdiction, will the United States eventually meet the Philippine demands?*

A. I don't believe the issue is quite as sharp as your question suggests, and I am confident of this, that two countries which have as much in common as the Philippine Republic and the United States have are going to find a mutually satisfactory answer to this problem. It is unthinkable that our whole problem of mutual security, which is so important to both of us, should collapse on this issue. I am sure it will not collapse because I have faith in the reasonableness and conciliatory nature of both parties.

*Q. Could you give us some information on the ideas of the United States thinking of the present internal strife in Indonesia?*

A. Well, it is always difficult and a little bit dangerous to try to diagnose what is essentially, I think, an internal development within Indonesia. But from the information that I have it would seem as though this was largely a problem of the degree of autonomy to be accorded to the different islands. It is a question of, you might say, the balance of power between the Federal Government and the various island communities. I do not believe that in its present manifestation it has any international aspects of significance.

#### Communist China

*Q. What assurances, undertakings, and actions would the United States require of Communist China before it would consider recognition of the Communist regime?*

A. Well, as I said in my statement, the United States looks at it from the standpoint of doing or not doing what will serve the best interests of the United States. Now when you have a regime which is avowedly hostile to us and all that we stand for, to my mind it doesn't make much sense that we should take action to make it stronger and enhance its influence and prestige in the world. The reason for our action is what basically I described and, if that reason disappeared, then I suppose we would have to reconsider the situation, but basically a nation conducts its foreign policy in such a way as to protect itself and recognition is something that is a privilege, not a right. No government has a right to have recognition. It is a privilege that is accorded, and we accord it when we think it will fit in with our national interest, and if it doesn't, we don't accord it.

*Q. Mr. Dulles, have you had talks today or talks*



at all here with Lord Home and Mr. Menzies on the situation in the Middle East, specifically the Gaza Strip?

A. Well, we have not discussed it except in the most casual way because, as I have said, I have not here in Canberra tried to keep in touch with that situation. That is being dealt with, from the standpoint of the United States, in Washington. And while we have alluded to it casually as we have met together on various topics, we have not had any serious talks about the matter because I have said to them the same thing that I have said to you here—I am not handling that phase of the matter for the Government of the United States. At the present time it is being handled by the Acting Secretary of State in Washington.

*Q. Can you express your views on the future form of administration of the Suez Canal?*

A. Well, the views that we hold are those that were expressed first at the conference in London where the 18 nations, including the United States, adopted certain proposals and the matter was further discussed in the Security Council of the United Nations and there the United States, as a member of the Security Council of the United Nations, voted for the so-called six principles. Then there were private discussions on the application of those six principles which were conducted by the Secretary-General as between the Foreign Secretaries of the United Kingdom, France, and Egypt, and those were expressed and embodied in a letter which the Secretary-General made public to the members of the United Nations. That all advanced the matter quite a long way toward what we think is an acceptable solution, and if that could be brought to a conclusion, as was forecast at that time, I think it would be generally acceptable.

*Q. Mr. Dulles, referring again to atomic weapons, would the United States forces in the Pacific have quick access to them in an emergency?*

A. The United States forces, yes indeed. Our forces almost everywhere nowadays have atomic weapons as almost a normal part of their equipment. Now we don't take them everywhere, but so far as they are on American soil and under American jurisdiction or on American ships, American planes, they have immediate access to atomic capabilities.

*Q. Following that, Mr. Dulles, the Commander in Chief of NATO said on his appointment that he would use, on behalf of NATO, he would make the fullest use of all atomic weapons. Does that policy also apply to the combined forces of SEATO?*

A. Well, of course we don't have quite the same military setup. There is no commander of a joint operation in SEATO as is the case with NATO, where there is a SACEUR, the Supreme Commander of Europe, who has the operational responsibility for forces of a number of different nationalities. But the United States forces which are committed to the defense of SEATO would have the same atomic capability as the United States forces do in NATO.

*Q. Does the United States envisage ever using the Woomera rocket range for rocket testing?*

A. Now you are out of my depth. I don't know. That is a matter that the Defense people would know about, but I don't know.

*Q. There was some speculation that Mr. Menzies would be asking you for a clear definition of United States policy on the Middle East during your visit here. I guess it was only speculation, but I wonder if you had been asked for that.*

A. No, I wasn't asked for that. I think our position is fairly clear. I will take one more question, and I have to get ready for dinner with Lord Home.

*Q. Have you a clear view of United States policy on the Middle East?*

A. Have I a clear view of it? I think so, yes.

## **Working Group on German Reunification Completes Report**

Press release 149 dated March 15

The Working Group, consisting of representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Federal Republic of Germany, which has been meeting at Washington to review the problem of German reunification in relation to European security, has now completed a report for the consideration of the four governments.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For an announcement of the meeting, which began on Mar. 6, and the names of the chief representatives of the four governments, see BULLETIN of Mar. 25, 1957, p. 491.

## German Minister for Atomic Affairs To Visit the United States

The U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State announced on March 12 (press release 136) that Siegfried Balke, German Federal Minister for Atomic Affairs, would arrive March 13, aboard the S.S. *United States*. He will be in the United States about 10 days.

In response to an invitation from the Department of State and Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. Balke will proceed to Washington for talks with officials of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission. Afterward, the Minister will visit the first full-scale nuclear power plant under construction at Shippingport, Pa., and the Commission's National Laboratories at Lemont, Ill., and Oak Ridge, Tenn. Before returning to Germany, Dr. Balke will visit Canada.

## Mr. Stassen To Represent U.S. at London Disarmament Meetings

Press release 139 dated March 13

Harold E. Stassen, Special Assistant to the President, will represent the U.S. Government at the forthcoming meetings of the Disarmament Subcommittee of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, which are expected to convene at London on March 18, 1957.

Amos J. Peaslee, formerly American Ambassador to Australia, will be the Deputy U.S. Representative.

The United Nations Disarmament Commission was established by the General Assembly in 1952 and is concerned with preparing proposals on all aspects of the regulation of armed forces and armaments, including nuclear weapons. The Commission is composed of the 11 members of the United Nations Security Council and Canada. In 1953, on recommendation of the General Assembly, the Disarmament Commission set up a Subcommittee of Five—Canada, France, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—to seek in private an acceptable solution of the disarmament problem. This Subcommittee met most recently at London in the spring of 1956. It has now been

reconvened to continue its efforts in accordance with a United Nations General Assembly resolution which passed 76-0 on February 15, 1957.<sup>1</sup>

## Hungary's National Holiday

*Statement by President Eisenhower*

White House press release dated March 15

March 15th is a day of special significance to the Hungarian people. As a traditional Hungarian national holiday commemorating the Hungarian people's struggle of 1848-49 against foreign domination, it symbolizes their enduring aspirations for freedom and national independence.

It is most fitting at this time, when the world has again witnessed the courageous sacrifice of the Hungarian people for these cherished ideals, that we should affirm our understanding of the meaning which this day has in the hearts and minds of Hungarians everywhere.

The struggle for human freedom has been a vital force in the history and progress of civilized mankind. In our highly interdependent modern society this struggle, wherever waged, has necessarily become the common concern of all humanity. Today, as in the time of Louis Kossuth, the American people deeply sympathize with the just demands of the Hungarian people for freedom and independence.

The suffering which the Hungarian people have undergone for the sake of these principles has forged an unbreakable bond with the free-world community. The Hungarian people have in their lifeblood written anew the message that an alien and unwelcome ideology cannot forcibly be imposed on a free-spirited people. When attempted, the inevitable result is the complete rejection of that ideology and hatred of those who seek to impose such tyranny upon others. In recognition of this truth which the Hungarian people have demonstrated, we can do no less than express our confident hope and our profound belief that the processes of enlightenment and justice among men and nations will triumph in the end in Hungary and in all other oppressed nations.

<sup>1</sup> For background, see BULLETIN of Feb. 11, 1957, p. 225, and Mar. 11, 1957, p. 423.

## Department Announcement Regarding Canadian Ambassador to Egypt

Press release 152 dated March 16

The Canadian Embassy has had discussions with the Department of State with regard to statements concerning E. H. Norman, now Canadian Ambassador to Egypt, made on March 14 during hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

The Department of State notes that comments were made in the committee hearings which could be interpreted as assigning to Mr. Norman certain questionable political affiliations. It should be pointed out that the investigation being undertaken by the committee lies entirely within the control of the committee. Allegations which may have been made regarding Mr. Norman in the course of the hearing do not represent opinions of the U.S. Government.

The United States maintains the friendliest relations with Canada and has every confidence in the Canadian Government's judgment in the selection of its official representatives.

## Tenth Anniversary of Greek-Turkish Aid Program

*Following are the texts of messages sent by President Eisenhower on March 12 to King Paul of Greece and President Celal Bayar of Turkey on the 10th anniversary of the Greek-Turkish Aid Program.*

### Message to King of Greece

White House press release dated March 12

YOUR MAJESTY: I am delighted to convey to you my greetings on the occasion of the anniversary of a decade of Greek-American cooperation in the interest of security and economic progress.

Ten years ago, Greece was fighting bravely for its very existence against the onslaught of communist imperialism. I acclaim Greek achievement in winning that struggle and then repairing the devastation it had caused, and in continuing to play an important part in the defense of the free world.

I am proud that Greece and the United States

have stood together during this difficult period. The partnership of our countries is a striking example of the way in which free nations working together can contribute to the peace and security of the international community.

Most respectfully,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

### Message to President of Turkey

White House press release dated March 12

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On the occasion of the anniversary of a decade of Turkish-American cooperation in the interest of security and economic progress, I am delighted to convey to you my greetings. I acclaim the accomplishments of Turkey during the past ten years in strengthening its position of enlightened leadership, and in taking an important part in the defense of the free world.

I am proud that Turkey and the United States have stood together during this difficult period. The partnership of our countries is a striking example of the way in which free nations working together can contribute to the peace and security of the international community.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

## Pan American Games

Press release 142 dated March 13

*In view of extensive press inquiries regarding the appropriation for the Pan American games scheduled to be held at Cleveland in 1959, Roy R. Rubottom, Jr., Acting Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, and I. W. Carpenter, Jr., Assistant Secretary-Controller, made the following statements on March 13:*

### STATEMENT BY MR. RUBOTTOM

The Pan American games were inaugurated after World War II by the Pan American Sports Congress, an organization composed of 29 nations of the Western Hemisphere. They are patterned after the Olympic games and are to be held every 4 years, the first having been held in Buenos Aires in 1951 and the second in Mexico City in 1955. It is my understanding that representatives of the

April 1, 1957

539

city of Cleveland issued an invitation to this group to hold the 1959 games in their city, and on March 11, 1955, this invitation was accepted by the Pan American Sports Congress and Cleveland was designated as the site for the 1959 games.

When the legislation was proposed, the Department commented as follows:

This occasion will provide our country with an opportunity to further promote pan-American friendship through the effective media of amateur sportsmanship. Our facilities, our hospitality and our treatment of the many visitors from abroad, both participants in the games and spectators, will be compared with that which was provided by Argentina and Mexico. It is important that this comparison not be to our discredit. Not only foreigners coming to Cleveland, but the millions who will follow the games abroad by press, radio and television will be apprised of the importance and attention our country gives these games. They can make a long-term contribution to our foreign policy objectives by creating a broader understanding of our country and people and our recognition of the importance of our good neighbors of this hemisphere.

It is the position of the Department that this undertaking by the city of Cleveland to be host to the Pan-American Games in 1959 merits appropriate support from the Federal Government. It may be appropriate to point out that the National Governments of both Argentina and Mexico provided substantial financial support in the organization of the games in their capitals.

On July 30, 1956, a joint resolution of Congress was approved as Public Law 833 and reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$5,000,000 for III Pan American Games (1959). The said appropriation shall be available for the purpose of promoting and insuring the success of the Pan American games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1959 and shall be expended in the discretion of the organization sponsoring said games, subject to such audit as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

#### STATEMENT BY MR. CARPENTER

The Department of State is in no way responsible for the issuance of the invitation for the games to be held in Cleveland. The Department's interest is based on its desire that the games be held in

circumstances and in an atmosphere which will promote friendly relations among the nations of this hemisphere. Since an American city is the host, it is particularly important that our foreign guests depart with a feeling that they have been among sincere friends.

An appropriation has been included in the Department's budget for fiscal year 1958. The Department is not in a position to speak to the details for which these funds are required. Officials of the city of Cleveland and of the Pan American Games Foundation are familiar with that.

The Department has no substantive responsibility for these games. Neither will it have a voice with regard to the manner in which these funds will be spent. It would seem appropriate, therefore, that justification for these funds should be advanced by the representatives of the Cleveland Pan American Games Foundation, which organization would have the responsibility rather than the Department.

The Department believes that the inclusion of this type of estimate in the State Department appropriation structure is undesirable since the State Department does not customarily engage in actually spending funds for activities of this kind within the United States. The Department will have no objection if this item were to be removed from its appropriation chapter.

#### Letters of Credence

##### *Haiti*

The newly appointed Ambassador of Haiti, Dantes Bellegarde, presented his credentials to President Eisenhower on March 11. For the texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 127.

##### *Chile*

The newly appointed Ambassador of Chile, Mariano Puga, presented his credentials to President Eisenhower on March 12. For the texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 133.



## INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

### Calendar of Meetings<sup>1</sup>

#### Adjourned During March 1957

U.N. General Assembly: 11th Session . . . . .	New York . . . . .	Nov. 12, 1956-Mar. 9, 1957.
U.N. ECOSOC Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities: 9th Session.	New York . . . . .	Feb. 18-Mar. 15
ICAO Technical Panel on Teletypewriter . . . . .	Montreal . . . . .	Feb. 19-Mar. 8
U.N. ECE Working Party on Gas Problems: 2d Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Feb. 25-Mar. 1
U.N. ECOSOC Population Commission: 9th Session . . . . .	New York . . . . .	Feb. 25-Mar. 8
ILO Governing Body: 134th Session (and Committees) . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Feb. 25-Mar. 9
International Sugar Council: Statistical Committee . . . . .	London . . . . .	Mar. 4 (1 day)
U.N. ECOSOC Committee on Nongovernmental Organizations . . . . .	New York . . . . .	Mar. 4-6
SEATO Engineering Workshop Study Group . . . . .	Rawalpindi, Pakistan . . . . .	Mar. 4-7
International Sugar Council: Executive Committee . . . . .	London . . . . .	Mar. 5 (1 day)
International Sugar Council: 12th Session . . . . .	London . . . . .	Mar. 6-7
FAO Committee on Relations with International Organizations . . . . .	Rome . . . . .	Mar. 7-8
U.N. ECAFE Industry and Trade Committee: 9th Session . . . . .	Bangkok . . . . .	Mar. 7-17
SEATO Council: 3d Meeting . . . . .	Canberra . . . . .	Mar. 11-13
Technical Advisory Council of Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences: 2d Meeting.	Turrialba, Costa Rica . . . . .	Mar. 11-14
FAO <i>Ad Hoc</i> Intergovernmental Meeting on Wheat and Coarse Grains.	Rome . . . . .	Mar. 11-15
International North Pacific Fisheries Commission: <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee for Study of Reports Submitted Under Article III 1 (a) of the International North Pacific Fisheries Convention.	Tokyo . . . . .	Mar. 11-17
9th Pakistan Science Conference . . . . .	Peshawar, West Pakistan . . . . .	Mar. 11-18
ILO Inland Transport Committee: 6th Session . . . . .	Hamburg . . . . .	Mar. 11-23
International North Pacific Fisheries Commission: Standing Commission on Biology and Research.	Tokyo . . . . .	Mar. 18-23
U.N. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East: 13th Session.	Bangkok . . . . .	Mar. 18-28
FAO Committee on Commodity Problems: 28th Session . . . . .	Rome . . . . .	Mar. 18-29
International Tin Study Group and Management Committee: 9th Meeting.	London . . . . .	Mar. 19-20
WMO Working Group on Networks of the Commission for Synoptic Meteorology.	DeBilt, Netherlands . . . . .	Mar. 19-30
U.S.-U.K. Bermuda Meeting . . . . .	Bermuda . . . . .	Mar. 21-23

#### In Session as of March 31, 1957

U.N. Trusteeship Council: Standing Committee on Petitions. . . . .	New York . . . . .	Feb. 18-
U.N. <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on Establishment of Special U.N. Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED).	New York . . . . .	Mar. 11-
ICAO Aerodromes, Air Routes, and Ground Aids Division: 6th Session.	Montreal . . . . .	Mar. 12-
U.N. Trusteeship Council: 19th Session . . . . .	New York . . . . .	Mar. 14-
U.N. Disarmament Commission: Subcommittee of Five . . . . .	London . . . . .	Mar. 18-
U.N. ECOSOC Commission on Status of Women: 11th Session . . . . .	New York . . . . .	Mar. 18-
ICEM Executive Committee: 7th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Mar. 28-

#### Scheduled April 1-June 30, 1957

FAO Cocoa Study Group: Statistical Subcommittee . . . . .	Rome . . . . .	Apr. 1-
UPU Executive and Liaison Committee . . . . .	Lausanne . . . . .	Apr. 1-

<sup>1</sup> Prepared in the Office of International Conferences, Mar. 15, 1957. Asterisks indicate tentative dates and places. Following is a list of abbreviations: U.N., United Nations; ECOSOC, Economic and Social Council; ICAO, International Civil Aviation Organization; ECE, Economic Commission for Europe; ILO, International Labor Organization; SEATO, Southeast Asia Treaty Organization; FAO, Food and Agriculture Organization; ECAFE, Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East; WMO, World Meteorological Organization; ICEM, Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration; UPU, Universal Postal Union; UNESCO, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; UNICEF, United Nations Children's Fund; GATT, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; ITU, International Telecommunication Union; NATO, North Atlantic Treaty Organization; WHO, World Health Organization; UNREF, United Nations Refugee Fund; PAIGH, Pan American Institute of Geography and History; PASO, Pan American Sanitary Organization.

## Calendar of Meetings—Continued

### Scheduled April 1-June 30, 1957—Continued

ILO Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers: 4th Session.	Geneva . . . . .	Apr. 1-
UNESCO Intergovernmental Advisory Committee on the Major Project on Mutual Appreciation of Asian and Western Cultural Values: 1st Meeting.	Paris . . . . .	Apr. 1-
FAO European Commission for Control of Foot-and-Mouth Disease: 4th Session.	Rome . . . . .	Apr. 2-
FAO Special Committee on Observer Status . . . . .	Rome . . . . .	Apr. 2-
FAO Cocoa Study Group: Executive Committee . . . . .	Rome . . . . .	Apr. 4-
ICEM Subcommittee on Coordination of Transport . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Apr. 5-
ICEM Council: 6th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Apr. 8-
U.N. Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation: 3d Meeting.	Geneva . . . . .	Apr. 8-
U.N. ECOSOC Commission on Human Rights: 13th Session . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Apr. 8-
U.N. ECAFE: 5th Regional Conference of Asian Statisticians . . .	Bangkok . . . . .	Apr. 8-
UNICEF Executive Board and Program Committee . . . . .	New York . . . . .	Apr. 8-
ILO Tripartite Working Party on Wages, Hours of Work, and Manning on Board Ship.	Geneva . . . . .	Apr. 11-
United States World Trade Fair . . . . .	New York . . . . .	Apr. 14-
U.N. Economic and Social Council: 23d Session . . . . .	New York . . . . .	Apr. 16-
Inter-American Commission of Women: Technical Experts and Administrative Heads of Women's Labor Bureaus.	México, D. F. . . . .	Apr. 20-
FAO International Poplar Commission: 9th Session . . . . .	Paris . . . . .	Apr. 22-
International Poplar Congress . . . . .	Paris . . . . .	Apr. 22-
ICAO Legal Committee: Subcommittee on Hire, Charter, and Interchange of Aircraft.	Madrid . . . . .	Apr. 24-
2d European Civil Aviation Conference . . . . .	Madrid . . . . .	Apr. 24-
9th ILO International Conference of Labor Statisticians . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Apr. 24-
U.N. ECE Steel Committee and Working Parties . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Apr. 24-
Inter-American Committee of Presidential Representatives: 3d Meeting.	Washington . . . . .	Apr. 29-
ITU Administrative Council: 12th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Apr. 29-
U.N. ECOSOC Narcotic Drugs Commission: 12th Session . . . .	New York . . . . .	Apr. 29-
U.N. Economic Commission for Europe: 12th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	Apr. 29-
South Pacific Commission: Conference on Review of the Commission.	Canberra . . . . .	Apr. 30-
International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage: 3d Congress .	San Francisco . . . . .	May 1-
10th International Cannes Film Festival . . . . .	Cannes . . . . .	May 2-
NATO Council: Ministerial Meeting . . . . .	Bonn . . . . .	May 2-
ILO Metal Trades Committee: 6th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	May 6-
FAO Technical Meeting on Soil Fertility for Latin America . . . .	Turrialba, Costa Rica . . . .	May 6-
U.N. ECE Seminar on Industrial Statistics . . . . .	Athens . . . . .	May 6-
U.N. ECOSOC Social Commission: 11th Session . . . . .	New York . . . . .	May 6-
FAO European Forestry Commission: 9th Session . . . . .	Rome . . . . .	May 7-
WHO: 10th World Health Assembly . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	May 7-
International Hydrographic Bureau: 7th Congress . . . . .	Monte Carlo . . . . .	May 7-
Inter-American Travel Congresses: Permanent Executive Committee.	Washington . . . . .	May 10-
FAO Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council: 7th Session . . . . .	Bandung . . . . .	May 13-
U.N. ECAFE Highway Subcommittee: Seminar on Highway Safety.	Tokyo . . . . .	May 13-
U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America: 7th Session . . .	La Paz . . . . .	May 15-
International Conference for Uses of Radar in Marine Navigation .	Genoa . . . . .	May 16-
International Cotton Advisory Committee: 16th Plenary Meeting .	Istanbul . . . . .	May 20-
International Commission for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries: 7th Meeting.	Lisbon . . . . .	May 20-
Customs Cooperation Council: 10th Session . . . . .	Brussels . . . . .	May 27-
WHO Executive Board: 20th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	May 27-
ILO Governing Body: 135th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	May 27-
U.N. ECE Housing Committee: 14th Session and Working Parties.	Geneva . . . . .	May 27-
UNREF Standing Program Subcommittee: 5th Meeting . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	May 27-
UNESCO Executive Board: 48th Session . . . . .	Paris . . . . .	May 27-
PAIGH Directing Council: 2d Meeting . . . . .	Rio de Janeiro . . . . .	May*
Inter-American Commission of Women: 12th General Assembly . .	Washington . . . . .	June 1-
FAO Council: 26th Session . . . . .	Madrid . . . . .	June 3-
UNREF Executive Committee: 5th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	June 3-
U.N. ECAFE Working Party on Small-Scale Industries and Handicraft Marketing: 5th Meeting.	India . . . . .	June 3-
World Power Conference: International Executive Council . . . .	Belgrade . . . . .	June 4-
World Power Conference: Sectional Meeting . . . . .	Belgrade . . . . .	June 5-
International Labor Conference: 40th Session . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	June 5-
FAO Asia-Pacific Forestry Commission: 4th Session . . . . .	Bandung . . . . .	June 8-

## Calendar of Meetings—Continued

### Scheduled April 1-June 30, 1957—Continued

GATT Balance-of-Payments Consultations . . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	June 10-
U.N. ECE Inland Transport Committee: Working Party on Transport of Dangerous Goods.	Geneva . . . . .	June 11-
PASO Executive Committee: 31st Meeting . . . . .	Washington . . . . .	June 12-
ICAO Panel on Future Requirements for Turbo-jet Aircraft: 3d Meeting.	Montreal . . . . .	June 17-
WMO Commission for Aerology: 2d Session . . . . .	Paris . . . . .	June 18-
WMO Commission for Instruments and Methods of Observation: 2d Session.	Paris . . . . .	June 18-
7th International Film Festival . . . . .	Berlin . . . . .	June 21-
FAO Technical Advisory Committee on Desert Locust Control: 7th Meeting.	Morocco* . . . . .	June 23*-
International Rubber Study Group: 13th Meeting . . . . .	Djakarta . . . . .	June 24-
International Council for the Exploration of the Sea: 45th Meeting .	London . . . . .	June 24-
International Whaling Commission: 9th Meeting . . . . .	London . . . . .	June 24-
U.N. ECAFE Iron and Steel Subcommittee: 7th Session . . . . .	Bangkok . . . . .	June 24-
FAO Desert Locust Control Committee: 4th Session . . . . .	Morocco* . . . . .	June 25*-
U.N. ECOSOC Coordination Committee. . . . .	Geneva . . . . .	June 25-
International Wheat Council: 22d Session . . . . .	London . . . . .	June

## Compliance With U.N. Resolution Calling for Withdrawal of Israel From Egyptian Territory

*Following is the text of a statement made by Henry Cabot Lodge, U.S. Representative to the General Assembly, on March 8, together with a statement made by Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld in the plenary session of February 22 and a report by the Secretary-General on March 8.*

### STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR LODGE, MARCH 8

U.S. delegation press release 2640

Today marks compliance with our first resolution of February 2<sup>1</sup> for the withdrawal of Israel from Egypt. The way now lies open to carry out our second resolution, which aims at achieving peaceful conditions after withdrawal.

This is an event in the history of the United Nations which is full of deep meaning for all people in the world—wherever they may be—who wish to be saved from the scourge of war.

It is an event which reflects credit on Israel, a nation which heeded the call of world opinion.

It is an event which reflects credit on those members, notably Egypt, who by patience and forbear-

ance demonstrated their steadfast faith in the United Nations.

It is an event which reflects credit on the skill, wisdom, and devotion to duty of the Secretary-General.

It is an event which proves again the value of the United Nations as an organization which plays an indispensable part in causing the world, as in this case, to take a turn away from war.

The United States welcomes the report of the Secretary-General and pledges its support to assure that what has now been achieved will be used as a foundation on which to build a good future for the people of the Near East free from the danger of conflict.

As is fitting, the report dwells on the constructive purposes of our second resolution of February 2.<sup>1</sup> This resolution stated that after full withdrawal of Israel from the Sharm el-Sheikh and Gaza areas the scrupulous maintenance of the Armistice Agreement required the placing of UNEF on the Egyptian-Israeli demarcation line and the implementation of other measures proposed in the Secretary-General's report of 24 January<sup>2</sup> to

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Feb. 25, 1957, p. 327.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Feb. 18, 1957, p. 275.

assist in achieving a situation conducive to the maintenance of peaceful conditions in the area.

The steady worsening of conditions along the armistice line which culminated in the hostilities of last October demonstrated how fear of aggression on one side begets fear on the other. Out of this fear comes the danger for the future.

It was to head off this danger that the Assembly endorsed the deployment of the United Nations Emergency Force on the armistice line and at the Straits of Tiran. It was with this danger in mind that I pointed out on January 28<sup>3</sup> that the deployment of the United Nations Emergency Force must be such as to assure a separation of the armed forces of both sides as required by the Armistice Agreement.

Now that we approach this new stage in the deployment of the UNEF, the United States appeals to all concerned to cooperate in giving effect to the practical and sensible measures which are set out in the reports by the Secretary-General of January 24, February 22, and March 8, and which are called for by the second resolution of February 2. The United States in particular is convinced that the continued deployment of the United Nations Emergency Force in accordance with the second resolution of February 2 affords the best hope of allaying the fear which has animated both sides and, thus, of establishing a basis for further progress toward peace and tranquillity in that part of the world.

We have made a wonderful beginning. We have nursed the patient through several crises. Now let us give him a chance to put some flesh on his bones, and build up an immunity to future illness.

#### STATEMENT BY SECRETARY-GENERAL, FEBRUARY 22

United Nations press release dated February 22

On February 11th I submitted the report (A/3527),<sup>4</sup> in pursuance of the resolution of the General Assembly of 2 February (A/Res/461). Events since then have not called for a further report and I have presented none.

It is well-known, however, that discussions have been carried on outside this house in the continuing resolve to attain the goals defined in the several resolutions of the

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 270.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, Mar. 11, 1957, p. 394.

General Assembly. I have maintained close contact with these activities and have been kept well-informed on them. These serious efforts to break through the unfortunate impasse and to unlock the door to constructive endeavour are deserving of warm appreciation.

Insofar as United Nations activities and positions are concerned, developments in the interim have given no reason to revise any of the substance of the previous report. However, in the light of some subsequent discussions in which I have engaged, I may make the following statement in the nature of a supplement to that report.

"The Secretary-General states with confidence that it is the desire of the Government of Egypt that the take-over of Gaza from the military and civilian control of Israel—which, as has been the case, in the first instance would be exclusively by UNEF—will be orderly and safe, as it has been elsewhere. It may be added with equal confidence that the Government of Egypt, recognizing the present special problems and complexities of the Gaza area and the long-standing major responsibility of the United Nations there for the assistance of the Arab refugees, and having in mind also the objectives and obligations of the Armistice Agreement, has the willingness and readiness to make special and helpful arrangements with the United Nations and some of its auxiliary bodies, such as UNRWA and UNEF. For example, the arrangement for the use of UNEF in the area should ensure its deployment on the Armistice line at the Gaza Strip and the effective interposition of the Force between the armed forces of Egypt and Israel. Similarly, the assistance of the United Nations and its appropriate auxiliary bodies would be enrolled toward putting a definite end to all incursions and raids across the border from either side. Furthermore, with reference to the period of transition, such other arrangements with the United Nations may be made as will contribute towards safeguarding life and property in the area by providing efficient and effective police protection; as will guarantee good civilian administration; as will assure maximum assistance to the U.N. refugee programme; and as will protect and foster the economic development of the territory and its people."

#### REPORT OF SECRETARY-GENERAL, MARCH 8

U.N. doc. A/3568

I

1. The General Assembly, on 2 February 1957, adopted a resolution (A/Res/460) in which, after recalling its previous resolutions on the same subject, the Assembly called upon Israel to complete its withdrawal behind the Armistice Demarcation Line without further delay.

2. The Foreign Minister of Israel, on 1 March, announced in the General Assembly the decision of the Government of Israel to act in compliance with the request in this resolution. The same day the Secretary-General instructed the Commander of the United Nations Emergency Force, as a matter of the utmost urgency, to arrange for a meeting with the Israel Commander-in-Chief, in order to agree with him on arrangements for the com-



plete and unconditional withdrawal of Israel in accordance with the decision of the General Assembly.

3. On 4 March, the Foreign Minister of Israel confirmed to the General Assembly the Government of Israel's declaration of 1 March. The same day the Commander of the United Nations Emergency Force met at Lydda with the Israel Commander-in-Chief. Technical arrangements were agreed upon for the withdrawal of Israel and the entry of the United Nations Emergency Force in the Gaza Strip during the hours of curfew on the night of 6/7 March. Arrangements were made for a similar take-over of the Sharm-al-Shaik area on 8 March.

4. On 6 March, General Burns reported that the "United Nations Emergency Force troops are now in position in all camps and centres of population in Gaza Strip". At that stage the operation had been carried out according to plan and without incidents. At 0400 GMT 7 March all Israelis had withdrawn from the Gaza Strip with the exception of an Israel troop unit at Rafah camp. By agreement, that last Israel element was to be withdrawn by 1600 GMT 8 March. Full withdrawal from the Sharm-al-Shaik area would be effected by the same time.

5. On 7 March, the Commander of the United Nations Emergency Force notified the population of Gaza that "the United Nations Emergency Force, acting in fulfilment of its functions as determined by the General Assembly of the United Nations with the consent of the Government of Egypt, is being deployed in this area for the purpose of maintaining quiet during and after the withdrawal of the Israeli defense forces. Until further arrangements are made, the United Nations Emergency Force has assumed responsibility for civil affairs in the Gaza Strip. . . UNRWA will continue to carry out its responsibility and will continue to provide food and other services as in the past. UNEF and UNRWA will do their best to relieve pressing needs which may arise from the present situation".

6. The Secretary-General, thus, is now in a position to report full compliance with General Assembly resolution I of 2 February 1957 (A/Res/460).

## II

7. On 2 February, the General Assembly adopted a second resolution (A/Res/461) "recognizing that withdrawal by Israel must be followed by action which would assure progress towards the creation of peaceful conditions" in the area. Under the terms of this resolution, the completion of withdrawal puts its operative paragraphs into full effect.

8. In the resolution on action to follow a withdrawal, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General, in consultation with the parties concerned, to carry out measures referred to in the resolution and to report as appropriate to the General Assembly. The Secretary-General will now devote his attention to this task. The stand of the General Assembly in the resolution is to be interpreted in the light of the report of the Secretary-General of 24 January (A/3512), which the Assembly noted "with appreciation".

9. Specifically, the General Assembly called upon the Governments of Egypt and Israel scrupulously to observe the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement be-

tween Egypt and Israel of 24 February 1949 and stated that it considered that, after full withdrawal of Israel from the Sharm-al-Shaik and Gaza areas, the scrupulous maintenance of the Armistice Agreement "requires a placing of the United Nations Emergency Force on the Egypt-Israel Armistice Demarcation Line".

10. The Assembly further stated that it considered that the maintenance of the Armistice Agreement requires the implementation of "other measures as proposed in the Secretary-General's report", with due regard to the considerations set out therein, with a view to assist in achieving situations conducive to the maintenance of peaceful conditions in the area. This statement, as it was formulated, read together with the request to the Secretary-General to consult with the parties, indicates that the General Assembly wished to leave the choice of these "other measures" to be decided in the light of further study and consultations.

## III

11. Arrangements made by the Commander of the United Nations Emergency Force provided for an initial take-over in Gaza by the Force. This was in accordance with the statement of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly on 22 February, that "the take-over of Gaza from the military and civilian control of Israel . . . in the first instance would be exclusively by UNEF". Instructions from the Secretary-General to the Commander of the United Nations Emergency Force reflected the position thus reported to the General Assembly. The notification by the Commander quoted in section I above indicates the basis for this initial take-over as well as its extent. The same statement indicates the importance of the role that UNRWA can play in the initial take-over.

12. In accordance with decisions of the General Assembly, UNRWA has important functions in relation to the refugees in Gaza, which constitute the major part of the population of the area. Because of these normal functions and of the additional contributions which that agency can make in aiding the non-refugee population, UNRWA is of essential assistance to the United Nations Emergency Force in its present operation. Therefore, and on the assumption that this course is in accordance with the General Assembly's wishes, the Director of UNRWA has agreed with the Secretary-General in this phase of the development to extend its immediate assistance beyond its normal functions. This would be done in fields which are related to those functions and in which a sharing of responsibilities devolving on the United Nations Emergency Force at the initial take-over seems indicated. The Secretary-General wishes to express his appreciation for this assistance, of which he feels he can avail himself within the terms established for the United Nations Emergency Force as they have to be applied in the present phase of its activities. To the extent that UNRWA in this context is incurring additional costs, the reason for which is within the sphere of the responsibilities of the United Nations Emergency Force, a question of compensation will arise for later consideration.

13. The United Nations may also incur other additional costs than those caused by the assistance rendered by

UNRWA. The Emergency Force may be in need of expert advice that can properly be provided by the Secretariat. If members of the Secretariat are taken over by the United Nations Emergency Force on a secondment basis, the cost obviously will be finally provided for as UNEF expenditures under the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. In other cases costs should be carried by the Secretariat in the normal way.

14. The Secretary-General finally wishes to inform the General Assembly that arrangements will be made through which, without any change of the legal structure or status of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, functions of UNTSO in the Gaza area will be placed under the operational control of the Force. A close co-operation between UNTSO and UNEF will be maintained.

## U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

### Inland Transport Committee of ILO

The Department of State announced on March 11 (press release 129) that the United States would be represented by the following tripartite delegation at the sixth session of the Inland Transport Committee of the International Labor Organization, convening at Hamburg, Federal Republic of Germany, from March 11 to 23:

#### REPRESENTING THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

##### Delegates

Kenneth H. Tuggle, Commissioner, Interstate Commerce Commission

Leon Greenberg, Chief, Division of Productivity and Technological Development, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor

##### Adviser

George Tobias, Labor Attaché, American Consulate General, Geneva, Switzerland

#### REPRESENTING THE EMPLOYERS OF THE UNITED STATES

##### Delegate

Ernest W. Harlan, Bruce Motor Freight, Des Moines, Iowa

#### REPRESENTING THE WORKERS OF THE UNITED STATES

##### Delegates

Rudolph Faupl, International Representative, International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO, Washington, D. C.

Harold Ulrich, General Chairman, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, Boston, Mass.

The Inland Transport Committee, one of eight industrial committees established by the ILO in 1945, is composed of government, worker, and employer representatives from specific industries.

These committees examine labor problems in their particular industries.

The agenda of the sixth session of the Inland Transport Committee, as fixed by the Governing Body at its 127th session (Rome, November 1954), includes reports concerning labor inspection in road transport; methods of improving organization of work and output in ports; and a general report, dealing particularly with (a) action taken in the various countries in light of the conclusions adopted at previous sessions of the Committee; (b) steps taken by the International Labor Office to follow up the studies and inquiries proposed by the Committee; and (c) recent events and developments in inland transport.

The 26 countries which have been invited to send tripartite delegates to this meeting are: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

### UNESCO Executive Board

The Department of State announced on March 11 (press release 130) the United States delegation to the 47th session of the Executive Board of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), which will meet at Paris on March 18. Prior to the convening of this session, an *ad hoc* committee will meet from March 11 to 15.

Athelstan F. Spilhaus, Dean of the Institute of Technology, University of Minnesota, is the U.S. representative on the Executive Board of UNESCO. Dr. Spilhaus will be assisted by the following advisers: Henry J. Kellermann, Counsel for UNESCO Affairs, American Embassy, Paris; Guy Lee, UNESCO Relations Staff, Department of State; and Byron Snyder, Office of International Administration, Department of State.

In addition to considering the report of the *ad hoc* committee on the reorganization of the Executive Board and the schedule of meetings for the next 2 years, the 47th session will also consider necessary readjustments in UNESCO's program and budget for 1957-58 to implement the decisions reached at the Ninth General Conference held at New Delhi in November 1956.

It is expected that the Executive Board's 47th session will adjourn on March 28.

## TREATY INFORMATION

### U.S. Signs Agreement With France on Defense Use of Technology

Press release 135 dated March 12

The Department of State announced on March 12 the signing of an agreement with France to facilitate the exchange of patent rights and technical information for defense purposes. The agreement was signed at Paris on March 12, 1957, by Christian Pineau, French Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Charles W. Yost, U.S. Chargé d'Affaires. The agreement with France entered into force on the date of signature.

The agreement is expected to foster the exchange of technology for defense purposes between the two Governments and between the private industries of the two countries. Thus, it should be of reciprocal benefit in providing for national defense and in contributing to the mutual defense of the North Atlantic Treaty area.

The agreement with France is the latest to be signed of a series negotiated with the NATO countries and other countries with which the United States has mutual defense ties. Similar agreements have been signed with Italy, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Norway, the Netherlands, Greece, the Federal Republic of Germany, Turkey, and Japan.

These agreements recognize that, whenever practicable, privately owned technology should generally be exchanged through commercial agreements between owners and users. They also note that rights of private owners of patents and technical information should be fully recognized and protected in accordance with laws applicable to such rights. The agreements are also intended to assure fair treatment of private owners when they deal directly with a foreign government. In addition, the agreements provide for the protection of technical information communicated through government channels and for the establishment of arrangements by which owners of patentable inventions placed under secrecy by one government may obtain comparable protection in the other country. The agreements further provide that, as a general rule, when government-owned inven-

tions are interchanged for defense purposes, this interchange will take place on a royalty-free basis.

Each of the agreements provides for the establishment of a Technical Property Committee to be composed of a representative of each government. These committees are charged with general responsibility for considering and making recommendations on any matters relating to the agreements brought before them by either government, either on their own behalf or on behalf of their nationals. One of the specific functions of the committee is to make recommendations to the governments, either in particular cases or in general, concerning disparities in their laws affecting the compensation of owners of patents and technical information.

The U.S. representative to the Technical Property Committees in Europe is assigned to the staff of the Defense Adviser, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations (USRO), 2 Rue St. Florentin, Paris.

Policy guidance for the U.S. representatives on the Technical Property Committees is provided by the Interagency Technical Property Committee for Defense, which is chaired by the Department of Defense and includes representatives of the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the International Cooperation Administration, and the Government Patents Board. This committee is assisted by an industry advisory group representing major sectors of American industry concerned with defense production.

### Educational Exchange Agreement With Ireland

Press release 151 dated March 16

An educational exchange agreement was signed at Dublin on March 16 between Ireland and the United States in connection with the use of the American grant counterpart fund. The agreement was signed by Liam Cosgrove, Minister for External Affairs, on behalf of Ireland, and William Howard Taft III, American Ambassador, on behalf of the United States.

The agreement provides that a sum of 500,000 pounds sterling out of the grant counterpart fund (which totals approximately 6,142,000 pounds sterling) is to be allotted, in the words of the agreement, "to promote further mutual under-



standing between the peoples of Ireland and the United States of America by wider exchange of knowledge through educational contacts."

The terms of the agreement provide that approximately 25,000 pounds sterling shall be expended annually for the purpose of financing studies, research, instruction, teaching, lecturing, and other educational activities on the part of Irish citizens in American schools, universities, and other institutions of higher learning on the one hand, and of American citizens in like educational institutions in Ireland on the other. The funds available under the agreement may be used to finance transportation, tuition, maintenance, and other expenses for such educational activities.

The scholarship exchange program will be administered by a joint Irish-American board in Dublin. The agreement will come into force when the Government of Ireland has notified the U.S. Government that the necessary legislative steps have been taken to implement the agreement. Further details as to the operation of the agreement, and as to the manner in which applications for scholarship benefits under it are to be applied for, will be announced at a later date.

## Current Actions

### MULTILATERAL

#### Aviation

Agreement on joint financing of certain air navigation services in Greenland and the Faroe Islands. Done at Geneva September 25, 1956.<sup>1</sup>

*Signatures:* Sweden, November 15, 1956; Belgium, Canada, Federal Republic of Germany, Israel, and Italy, November 28, 1956.

*Acceptances deposited:* Canada, January 18, 1957; Iceland, February 18, 1957.

Agreement on joint financing of certain air navigation services in Iceland. Done at Geneva September 25, 1956.<sup>1</sup>

*Signatures:* Sweden, November 15, 1956; Belgium, Canada, Federal Republic of Germany, Israel, and Italy, November 28, 1956.

*Acceptances deposited:* Canada, January 18, 1957; Iceland, February 18, 1957.

#### Copyright

Universal copyright convention. Done at Geneva September 6, 1952. Entered into force September 16, 1955. TIAS 3324.

*Accession deposited:* Ecuador, March 5, 1957.

Protocol 1 concerning application of the convention to the works of stateless persons and refugees. Done at

Geneva September 6, 1952. Entered into force September 16, 1955. TIAS 3324.

*Accession deposited:* Ecuador, March 5, 1957.

Protocol 2 concerning application of the convention to the works of certain international organizations. Done at Geneva September 6, 1952. Entered into force September 16, 1955. TIAS 3324.

*Accession deposited:* Ecuador, March 5, 1957.

#### Slave Trade

Convention to suppress the slave trade and slavery. Signed at Geneva September 25, 1926. Entered into force March 9, 1927. 46 Stat. 2183.

*Accession deposited:* Libya, February 14, 1957.

#### Trade and Commerce

International convention to facilitate the importation of commercial samples and advertising material. Dated at Geneva November 7, 1952. Entered into force November 20, 1955.<sup>2</sup>

*Notification by United Kingdom of extension to:* Aden, Barbados, British Guiana, British Honduras, Cyprus, Falkland Islands, Fiji, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gold Coast, Hong Kong, Jamaica, Kenya,<sup>3</sup> Leeward Islands (Antigua, Montserrat, St. Christopher, Nevis, Anguilla, and British Virgin Islands), Federation of Malaya, Malta,<sup>3</sup> Mauritius, North Borneo, Federation of Nigeria, St. Helena, Sarawak, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somaliland Protectorate, Tanganyika,<sup>3</sup> Trinidad and Tobago,<sup>3</sup> Uganda,<sup>3</sup> the Windward Islands (Tonga, Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent), and Zanzibar, February 5, 1957.

### BILATERAL

#### El Salvador

Treaty of friendship, commerce and consular rights. Signed at San Salvador February 22, 1926. Entered into force September 5, 1930. 46 Stat. 2817.

*Notification by the United States of elimination of article VI:* February 8, 1957.

#### Mexico

Air transport agreement. Effected by exchange of notes at Mexico March 7, 1957. Enters into force June 5, 1957.

#### Sweden

Agreement amending the agreement of January 18, 1956 (TIAS 3477) for cooperation concerning civil uses of atomic energy. Signed at Washington August 3, 1956. *Entered into force:* March 12, 1957 (date on which each Government received from the other written notification that it has complied with statutory and constitutional requirements).

#### Thailand

Agricultural commodities agreement under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 454, 455; 69 Stat. 44, 721). Signed at Bangkok March 4, 1957. Entered into force March 4, 1957.

#### United Kingdom

Agreement amending sections 5 and 6 of the financial agreement of December 6, 1945 (TIAS 1545) by providing for the conditions under which annual installments may be deferred. Signed at Washington March 6, 1957. Enters into force when each Government notifies the other that it has approved the agreement.

<sup>2</sup> Not in force for the United States.

<sup>3</sup> With reservation.

<sup>1</sup> Not in force.



## DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

### Foreign Service Examination

Press release 125 dated March 8

The Department of State announced on March 8 that the semiannual Foreign Service officer examination will be given on June 24, 1957, at more than 65 centers throughout the United States. This examination is open to all who meet the age and citizenship requirements outlined below.

Officials of the Department of State estimate that several hundred new Foreign Service officers will be required during the next year to fill positions overseas and in Washington, D.C. After completing 3 months of training at the Foreign Service Institute in Washington, some of the new officers will take up duties at the 270 American embassies, legations, and consulates around the world. At these posts, which range in size from the large missions such as Paris and London to the one-man posts such as Perth, Australia, the new officer may expect to do a variety of tasks, including administrative work; political, economic, commercial, and labor reporting; consular duties; and assisting and protecting Americans and protecting U.S. property abroad. Other new officers will be assigned to the Department's headquarters at Washington, where they will engage in research or other substantive work, or in the many administrative tasks which are essential to the day-to-day conduct of foreign affairs.

To explain fully these opportunities in the Foreign Service which await the qualified young men and women of the United States, Foreign Service officers will visit a large number of colleges and universities this spring. In order to make known the diversified needs of the Department of State and Foreign Service, these officers will talk not only with promising students of history, political science, and international relations but also with those who are specializing in economics, foreign languages, and business and public administration.

Those successful in the 1-day written examination, which tests the candidate's facility in English expression, general ability, and background, as well as his proficiency in a modern foreign

language, will subsequently be given an oral examination by panels which will meet in regional centers throughout the United States. Those candidates who pass the oral test will then be given a physical examination and a security investigation. Upon completion of these phases, the candidate will be nominated by the President as a Foreign Service officer of class 8, vice consul, and secretary in the diplomatic service.

To be eligible to take the examination, candidates must be at least 20 years of age and under 31, as of May 1, 1957, and must also be American citizens of at least 9 years' standing. Although a candidate's spouse need not be a citizen on the date of the examination, citizenship must have been obtained prior to the date of the officer's appointment.

Starting salaries for successful candidates range from \$4,750 to \$5,350 per year, depending upon the age, experience, and family status of the individual. In addition, insurance, medical, educational, and retirement benefits are granted, as well as annual and sick leave.

Application forms may be obtained by writing to the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C. The closing date for filing the application is May 1, 1957.

### Confirmations

The Senate on March 14 confirmed David K. E. Bruce to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany. (For biographic details, see press release 89 dated February 25.)

The Senate on March 14 confirmed C. Douglas Dillon to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State. (For biographic details, see press release 22 dated January 14.)

The Senate on March 14 confirmed Elbridge Durbrow to be Ambassador to Viet-Nam. (For biographic details, see press release 104 dated March 1.)

The Senate on March 14 confirmed Amory Houghton to be Ambassador to France. (For biographic details, see press release 88 dated February 25.)

The Senate on March 14 confirmed Thorsten V. Kaljarvi to be an Assistant Secretary of State. (For biographic details, see press release 98 dated February 28.)

The Senate on March 14 confirmed G. Frederick Reinhardt to be Counselor of the Department of State. (For biographic details, see press release 56 dated February 7.)

The Senate on March 14 confirmed William J. Sebald to be Ambassador to Australia. (For biographic details, see press release 90 dated February 25.)

## Resignations

Herman Phleger as Legal Adviser, effective about April 1. (For text of Mr. Phleger's letter to the President and the President's reply, see White House press release dated March 13.)

## PUBLICATIONS

## Foreign Relations Volume

Press release 107 dated March 4

The Department of State on March 16 released *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1939, Volume II, General, The British Commonwealth, and Europe*. All the other volumes of the five for 1939 have previously been published except *Volume V, The American Republics*, which is in process of preparation.

The first 212 pages of this volume contain papers on various general subjects: Antarctic claims and exploration, assistance to refugees, fisheries off the coast of Alaska, and a number of technical and economic problems.

Documentation on relations with the British Commonwealth (pages 213-364) includes sections on the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, and India. Problems of relations between the United States as a neutral and the British as belligerents are covered, as well as other usual matters of diplomacy. Among the war subjects treated is the sinking of the S. S. *Athenia* with loss of American lives. It was only after the war that it was fully established that this was an act of a German submarine.

The remaining 534 pages of documentation cover relations with individual continental European countries. The Soviet Union is omitted, since the record for that country has already been published in *Foreign Relations of the United States, The Soviet Union, 1933-1939*. As would be expected for a year in which the general European war began, subjects of diplomacy included normal peacetime diplomatic relations as well as subjects connected with the crises leading to war and into the war itself. While the coming of the war is primarily treated in volume I, this volume contains the record on the absorption of Albania by Italy, problems arising from the annexation of Austria by Germany, and the Spanish Civil War.

In the section on Italy are recorded suggestions by President Roosevelt regarding the opportunity for Mussolini to contribute to the maintenance of peace. The appointment of Myron C. Taylor as the President's personal representative to Pope Pius XII is documented in a section on the Vatican.

Copies of volume II (vii, 911 pp.) may be obtained from the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., for \$4 each.

## Check List of Department of State Press Releases: March 11-17

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.

Press releases issued prior to March 11 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 107 of March 4 and 125 of March 8.

No.	Date	Subject
127	3/11	Haiti credentials (rewrite).
128	3/11	Dulles: SEATO Council, March 11.
129	3/11	Delegation to ILO Inland Transport Committee (rewrite).
130	3/11	Delegation to UNESCO Executive Board (rewrite).
131	3/11	U.S. reply to Soviet note on Middle East.
132	3/11	Ambassador Richards: departure statement.
133	3/12	Chile credentials (rewrite).
*134	3/12	Herter: death of Admiral Byrd.
135	3/12	U.S.-French agreement on defense use of technology.
136	3/12	Visit of German Minister for Atomic Affairs.
*137	3/12	Statement on accident involving Yugoslav U.N. representative.
138	3/13	Dulles: SEATO Council, March 12.
139	3/13	Delegation to Disarmament Subcommittee meetings.
140	3/13	Dulles: SEATO Council, March 13.
141	3/13	SEATO communique.
142	3/13	Statement on Pan American games.
†143	3/13	Lightner: statement on amendments to Smith-Mundt Act.
144	3/14	Dulles: press conference, Canberra, March 13.
145	3/14	Murphy: "The U.S. Looks at the Middle East."
*146	3/14	Folger nominated Ambassador to Belgium.
†147	3/15	Kalijarvi: statement on amending Anglo-American financial agreement of 1945.
*148	3/15	Christie retirement.
149	3/15	Working Group on German reunification completes report.
†150	3/16	U.S. note to Dominican Government on disappearance of Gerald Murphy.
151	3/16	Educational exchange agreement with Ireland.
152	3/16	Announcement on Canadian Ambassador to Egypt.

\*Not printed.

†Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

<b>American Republics.</b> Pan American Games . . .	539	<b>Israel.</b> Compliance With U.N. Resolution Calling for Withdrawal of Israel From Egyptian Territory (Lodge, Hammarskjold) . . . . .	543
<b>Asia.</b> Third Meeting of the Council of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (Dulles, text of communique) . . . . .	527	<b>Middle East</b>	
<b>Atomic Energy.</b> German Minister for Atomic Affairs To Visit the United States . . . . .	538	Ambassador Richards Leaves for Middle East . . .	526
<b>Australia.</b> Confirmations (Sebald) . . . . .	549	Compliance With U.N. Resolution Calling for Withdrawal of Israel From Egyptian Territory (Lodge, Hammarskjold) . . . . .	543
<b>Canada.</b> Department Announcement Regarding Canadian Ambassador to Egypt . . . . .	539	The United States Looks at the Middle East (Murphy) . . . . .	515
<b>Chile.</b> Letters of Credence (Puga) . . . . .	540	United States Replies to Soviet Proposal for Declaration on Middle East (texts of U.S. and Soviet notes) . . . . .	523
<b>China, Communist.</b> Third Meeting of the Council of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (Dulles) . . . . .	527	<b>Mutual Security.</b> U.S. Signs Agreement With France on Defense Use of Technology . . . . .	547
<b>Communism.</b> Third Meeting of the Council of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (Dulles, text of communique) . . . . .	527	<b>Presidential Documents</b>	
<b>Congress, The.</b> Department Announcement Regarding Canadian Ambassador to Egypt . . . . .	539	Hungary's National Holiday . . . . .	538
<b>Department and Foreign Service</b>		Tenth Anniversary of Greek-Turkish Aid Program . . . . .	539
Confirmations (Bruce, Dillon, Durbrow, Houghton, Kalijarvi, Reinhardt, Sebald) . . . . .	549	<b>Publications.</b> Foreign Relations Volume . . . . .	550
Foreign Service Examination . . . . .	549	<b>Treaty Information</b>	
Resignations (Phleger) . . . . .	550	Current Actions . . . . .	548
<b>Disarmament.</b> Mr. Stassen To Represent U.S. at London Disarmament Meetings . . . . .	538	Educational Exchange Agreement With Ireland . . . . .	547
<b>Economic Affairs.</b> Inland Transport Committee of ILO (delegation) . . . . .	546	U.S. Signs Agreement With France on Defense Use of Technology . . . . .	547
<b>Educational Exchange.</b> Educational Exchange Agreement With Ireland . . . . .	547	<b>Turkey.</b> Tenth Anniversary of Greek-Turkish Aid Program . . . . .	539
<b>Egypt.</b> Compliance With U.N. Resolution Calling for Withdrawal of Israel From Egyptian Territory (Lodge, Hammarskjold) . . . . .	543	<b>U.S.S.R.</b> United States Replies to Soviet Proposal for Declaration on Middle East (texts of U.S. and Soviet notes) . . . . .	523
<b>Europe.</b> Foreign Relations Volume . . . . .	550	<b>United Kingdom.</b> Foreign Relations Volume . . . . .	550
<b>France</b>		<b>United Nations</b>	
Confirmations (Houghton) . . . . .	549	Compliance with U.N. Resolution Calling for Withdrawal of Israel From Egyptian Territory (Lodge, Hammarskjold) . . . . .	543
U.S. Signs Agreement With France on Defense Use of Technology . . . . .	547	Inland Transport Committee of ILO (delegation) . . . . .	546
<b>Germany</b>		UNESCO Executive Board (delegation) . . . . .	546
Confirmations (Bruce) . . . . .	549	The United States Looks at the Middle East (Murphy) . . . . .	515
German Minister for Atomic Affairs To Visit the United States . . . . .	538	<b>Viet-Nam.</b> Confirmations (Durbrow) . . . . .	549
Working Group on German Reunification Completes Report . . . . .	537		
<b>Greece.</b> Tenth Anniversary of Greek-Turkish Aid Program (Eisenhower) . . . . .	539	<b>Name Index</b>	
<b>Haiti.</b> Letters of Credence (Bellegarde) . . . . .	540	Balke, Siegfried . . . . .	538
<b>Hungary.</b> Hungary's National Holiday (Eisenhower) . . . . .	538	Bellegarde, Dantes . . . . .	540
<b>International Organizations and Conferences</b>		Bruce, David K.E. . . . .	549
Calendar of Meetings . . . . .	541	Carpenter, I.W., Jr. . . . .	540
Inland Transport Committee of ILO (delegation) . . . . .	546	Dillon, C. Douglas . . . . .	549
Mr. Stassen To Represent U.S. at London Disarmament Meetings . . . . .	538	Dulles, Secretary . . . . .	529
UNESCO Executive Board (delegation) . . . . .	546	Durbrow, Elbridge . . . . .	549
<b>Ireland.</b> Educational Exchange Agreement With Ireland . . . . .	547	Eisenhower, President . . . . .	538, 539
		Hammarskjold, Dag . . . . .	544
		Houghton, Amory . . . . .	549
		Kalijarvi, Thorsten V. . . . .	549
		Lodge, Henry Cabot . . . . .	543
		Murphy, Robert . . . . .	515
		Norman, E. H. . . . .	539
		Phleger, Herman . . . . .	550
		Puga, Mariano . . . . .	540
		Reinhardt, G. Frederick . . . . .	549
		Richards, James P. . . . .	526
		Rubottom, Roy R., Jr. . . . .	539
		Sebald, William J. . . . .	549
		Stassen, Harold E. . . . .	538



the  
Department  
of  
State

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents  
Govt. Printing Office  
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$.....  
(cash, check, or  
money order).

UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS  
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID  
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300  
(GPO)

Foreign Relations of the United States

The basic source of information on  
U. S. diplomatic history

1939, Volume II

General, The British Commonwealth, and Europe

The first 212 pages of this volume contain papers on various general subjects: Antarctic claims and exploration, assistance to refugees, fisheries off the coast of Alaska, and a number of technical economic problems.

Documentation on relations with the British Commonwealth (pp. 213-364) includes sections on the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, and India. Problems of relations between the United States as a neutral and the British as belligerents are covered, as well as other usual matters of diplomacy. Among the war subjects treated is the sinking of the S.S. *Athenia* with loss of American lives. It was only after the war that it was fully established that this was an act of a German submarine.

The remaining 534 pages of documentation cover relations with individual continental European countries. The Soviet Union is omitted, since the record for that country has already been published in *Foreign Relations of the United States, The Soviet Union, 1933-1939*. As would be expected for a year in which the general European war began, subjects of diplomacy included normal peacetime diplomatic relations as well as subjects connected with the crises leading to war and into the war itself. While the coming of the war is primarily treated in volume I, this volume contains the record on the absorption of Albania by Italy, problems arising from the annexation of Austria by Germany, and the Spanish Civil War. In the section on Italy are recorded suggestions by President Roosevelt regarding the opportunity for Mussolini to contribute to the maintenance of peace. The appointment of Myron C. Taylor as the President's personal representative to Pope Pius XII is documented in a section on the Vatican.

Copies of this publication may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., for \$4 each.

Please send me .... copies of *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1939, Volume II, General, The British Commonwealth, and Europe*.

Name: .....

Street Address: .....

City, Zone, and State: .....



